

ORIGINAL ENGLISH EDITION

NOV 8 '39

INDEXED

274

Indef

# The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 542

OCTOBER, 1939

Vol. 273

1. Old Germanies for New.  
By W. J. Blyton.
2. A Plea for Social History.  
By G. G. Coulton, Litt.D.
3. The Chaos in Proprietary Medicine Law.  
By A. St Clair Geddes.
4. Restorations.  
By Sir Charles Petrie, Bart.
5. America and Isolation.  
By R. J. N. Gould-Adams.
6. The Value of State Social Services.  
By Dr B. G. M. Baskett.
7. The Sacred Fire.  
By C. E. Lawrence.
8. The Irish Republican Army.
9. Arms and the Empire Overseas.  
By Donald Cowie.
10. Museums.  
By Whitwell M. Dodd.
11. National Unity and Party Government.  
By Sir John A. R. Marriott.
12. The Call.  
Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

*Sale Agents for American Continent*

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter  
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

# **TO SUBSCRIBERS**

# **AND AGENCIES**

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.



# THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 542.—OCTOBER 1939.

## Art. 1.—OLD GERMANIES FOR NEW.

EVENTS tend to obscure the truth that well into the nineteenth century Germany had a culture of the spirit, as distinct from a Kultur of the parade ground, notwithstanding that Frederick had left a permanent mark upon the Prussia which was his professional army and the nucleus of the modern German War-State. To read the Letters between Goethe and Schiller—a book, says Gissing, which ‘helps one to forget the idle or venomous talk going on everywhere around us, and bids us cherish hope for a world which “has such people in’t”’—or Winckelman, of whom Pater wrote so revealingly; or Kant, on his project, generations in advance, for a League of the Nations; or the calm philosopher-scientist Lotze; again, to read Heine’s affectionately teasing references to his fatherland (Jew though he was, and citizen of the world, waving away offers of French naturalisation) and its fondness for pipe, beer, music, metaphysics, bad art, clumsy politics, and good science; and finally to sojourn a few times, as one has done, in tracts of Germany which well might have never heard of Nazismus by the aspect of things and the bonhomie of the peasants—is to see that there does exist, overlaid, suppressed, and leading a ‘catacomb’ life, a Western, Christian, humane Germany not catered for in raw and unscrupulous propaganda and simply not understood in that bible for cads ‘Mein Kampf.’ What is its strength, its significance, and what its prospects of present influence and future revival? As one in touch with this hidden—or hiding—Germany, slighted but enduring, I may succeed in supplying some data for an answer. Having lived in German homes, worshipped or gone music-making and picnicking with

Vol. 273.—No. 542.

Germans, and received them into my English home; having correspondents there now who remember, as I do, something prior to the Third Reich, and never having lost touch with Teutonic history and current literature, I shall try not to neglect impartiality and even charity.

First, the fate of organised religion there is a surprise and a cruel enigma to observers outside, particularly as there was once a united and influential Centrum, a Church also rich in cultural and 'Action' associations. A *partial* explanation is that the relation between Church and State has for centuries been different in Germany from the relation elsewhere. The idea has never been unfamiliar there, of the Faith as an organised instrument of the community or State. Churchmen were bound of old to vote ecclesiastical honours, property, and powers to the younger sons of royal or aristocratic houses, and the Church lived under the sign of its political destiny. Hence Luther's path to subjection of religion to the princes was easier. The reform also increased another German trait—personal, subjective religion, disengaged from outer norms and discipline. None so bold in mind as your thinking German; none so meekly conformist in social and political conduct. How many philosophers and thinkers one could catalogue who have liberated subversive and dissolvent theories, yet have been themselves embodiments of the timid, subservient, regular, and conventional! It is a paradox that the country of Faustian free thought has been the country also of illiberal 'reaction,' of a certain provincialism of atmosphere, of over-organisation, officialism, and militarism. Goethe's Weimar was typical: adventurous thinking, a certain universalism of mind, going with an almost comic-opera snugness of social order. The German has a notion of the liberty of conscience quite different from ours, from the French, or from the Italian. He will submit to the most severe outward constraints, but will not easily surrender his spiritual liberty or, if he be not a spiritual man, will cling to his right to dream or to be sceptical. This implies a tendency to what in fact we see, the individual exegesis of dogma, the wilful creation of his own morals, even the invention of his own religion, myth, or *Weltanschauung*. Precisely this temperamental foundation has been built upon by National Socialism,

or mystical neo-Germanism, with its dramatisation of itself as an undying Siegfried or Wotan or Lohengrin, and the Germans as the *Urvolk* or primitive race who are reserved for the destiny of world-rule. It also accounts for the considerable degree of detachment from the new current creed which many feel. Yet a majority have an ingrained desire for a glamorous visible leader, and also to be brigaded, deputed, and ordered. It is the factor of organisation in the Army which satisfies most Germans, rather than the awkward, disillusioning encounter with English or French fighting men hand to hand. Their ideal would be a world in which war was not necessary: the mere sound, sight, and prestige of the organised host and the reputation of a Kultur should 'render bloodshed unnecessary.'

It was only the other day, in Whitweek, that Cardinal Faulhaber gave expression to the hunted and momentarily unfashionable Germany, when unveiling a memorial to fallen chaplains and students.

'This,' he said, 'is the moment for recalling facts, when priests are made to listen to every sort of complaint, libel, and menace, and are openly threatened that they must be hounded out. Yet it would be difficult to imagine any who have been tested being disloyal to the Church in this new Kulturkampf. Frederick the Great once gave about a Catholic, who had offered him his services in the struggle against the Church, this royal answer: "Let him go; I consider him a traitor to his own flag." . . . I remember when Army officers of the highest rank used to take part in the spiritual conferences, and even attended the concluding services of the spiritual retreats for soldiers. But to-day different opinions prevail in certain high places, and the Sunday religious ceremonies have ceased to be considered and esteemed as services. There are honourable exceptions for which we are deeply grateful. We hope there will always be some intelligent people in Germany to realise that an anti-religious attitude only ends in sapping the people's power of resistance. To arm a nation in a military sense and to disarm it in a religious sense only leads to all-round paralysis. Loyalty and the spirit of sacrifice to death are intimately linked with religion.'

The truth of that diagnosis is as remarkable as its bravery. It flashes a beam upon one of the rocks on

which the Third (but not the last) Reich will assuredly split.

Only less boldly because he is not resident in Germany, Count Ferdinand Czernin indicts the present masters of a subtly divided Germany :

'I happen to be an Austrian. As an Austrian with all my heart, I am a German too, and as good a German as you, my Führer. But I refuse to become a Prussian, either by race or, so help me God, by mentality. I love and cherish that Germany of ours. Not yours, my Führer, for yours isn't the true Germany that is dear to our hearts. The Germany we love is that free, that honest, that faithful Germany which still exists, though you are too hypnotised by yourself to see it. That Germany is still there to-day, though God alone knows whether it still will be after you have done with it, you leader to Germany's doom !' \*

Herr Rauschnig, ex-president of the Danzig Senate, in 'Germany's Revolution of Destruction' is even more pessimistic concerning any fragments remaining over.

The vociferous propaganda-machine directs particular scorn upon the past as a dreamy, ineffectual phase. 'You other nations,' the loudspeaker shouts, 'would very much like to have that Germany back, instead of the armed giant you see.' Granted : we would, if we are persons of intelligence, with a ray of the spirit and a tincture of letters. Whatever its naïveté and provincialism in some matters, it was a community of thought and art and tolerance ; grander, past the efficiency of words to convey, than what is supplanting it—albeit we must admit too that many changes in other countries are not for the better. It was nobler, as the finer sort of Junker Officer—such as served Mr Morgan for Marwitz in 'The Castle'—with his scrupulous religion, is nobler than the careerist kow-towing to a Party *leiter* or a Gestapo observation-man ; nobler as a Lessing and Richter, Brahms and Beethoven are nobler than Dr Goebbels and his incredible rudeness ; and its Fritzs and Hermanns and Dorotheas were finer clay, and somewhat healthier in mind and nerve, than boys at the age of puberty bullied into being 'manly and brutal,' forced out of religious schools into Hitler classes. People then were at least living according

---

\* Page 246 in 'Europe, Going, Going, Gone !'

to the dictates of their nature, not wrenched into shapes obedient to imposed new rules of dynamism and activism which are without a real rationale or goal. They were, therefore, stronger in being soundly based. What has partly taken its place are strain, forced activities, and feigned likings; and even where the craze is a genuine enthusiasm, it is of the sort which burns itself up and does not feed mind or soul. An *ersatz* religion is worse, in one significant respect, than blank irreligion; it more successfully masks the inner wasting, and the results may actually be the worse for being delayed.

In just one particular the present régime would like the outside world to believe that the older, freer, and saner Fatherland exists: that is to say, the belief is necessary for the tourist industry, and accordingly we are shown in our own Press, and during this last year or more of crisis and abuse, large advertisements evoking the Germany of Gretchen, alpine horns, music, moonlight, *schloss*, cathedral, peasant costume, and crafts. It is another curious illustration of the desire to have it both ways. The hotel-keeper and guest-master develop, what is the last thing most Germans can develop, positive tact in dealing with their rarer visitors, especially English, and 'encircle' them with anything but Nazi papers or political reminders. They either find it an escape to avoid the incessant political motif or seem to have a 'dispensation' from their nearest *Gauleiter*. The nearest that conversation this summer in the lounge could approach to current affairs was a sincere wish that there should be no war, and that there should be more tourists and fewer soldiers marching. And, as a special humorous confidence, a whispered variant on the national motto: 'One Reich, one Führer—one Visitor.'

The truth is that most Germans are, even now, altered mainly on the surface and by order of the State. A new set of orders and we should promptly see this exceedingly malleable, biddable people assume new 'mind-attitudes.' A surprising number, if Hitler only knew it, want neither world-power nor downfall. The new rôle and its ideology sit uneasily on many; so obviously does it conflict with trade, popularity, home comforts, and amenities. There is a feverish iteration of 'unity' in official quarters, but less of the thing. The ex-Kaiser at Doorn may reflect



that up to 1914, when the European atmosphere and position were what they were in 1938-9, he at least had kept his people fairly unified, Socialists, Churchmen, soldiers, and the masses alike; and did not need such elaborate Gestapo precautions, so many staged events, so many concentration camps, and had not so hopelessly alienated liberal and ecclesiastical feeling. Under the last Hohenzollern, as the world now sees, Germans were conspicuously more free than to-day, and were also better off. It was not such morbid tension to live under him, as now when people have to hail Hitler—but have to watch Himmler. There was a far wider range and choice of atmospheres, interests, ideas, artists, writers, recreations, and foreign contacts. Far more than half of these are now *verboten*. If Joseph Conrad found it, on the eve of the last war, 'singularly barren of manifestations of generous sympathies and magnanimous impulses—an ineradicable, invincible provincialism of envy and vanity clings to the forms of its thought,' what would he find to-day when the ideological cage has been reduced to a quarter of that size? When the Thomas Manns, Einsteins and others have been chased overseas, and when liberal and religious papers and ecclesiastical schools have been shut down, and in their place a few official voices, mutually imitative, propound the same narrow circle of ideas? He then saw in it 'a grinding, superficial civilisation,' but it at least had outlets and reliefs. There were men of education and uncensored ideas in a number of key positions, not simply what Herr Hitler demands—'100 per cent. military men in all top posts.' Wilhelm was a little proprietorial in his attitude toward the Creator, but he was smiled at, and he did not go the length of Goebbels, who in May said, 'I believe in a German God, not a Christian God.' Society was not Aryanised—and sterilised. Light could be struck out by the collision of diverse views; Germans could get out of themselves from time to time and see themselves as others see them. Max Reinhardt staged 'The Miracle,' Mann wrote 'Buddenbrook,' and 'Vorwärts' criticised the government. But as the Führer says, 'We have finished with that welter of democracy,' and in its stead he has 79 millions of men, women, and children being moulded into one pattern, so far as human agencies can compass it, infinitely repeated.

Human nature, however, even Teutonic human nature, is not all plasticene yet, and there are numbers who are not included in the collective hallucination. All the Nazi leaders periodically scold the 'intellectuals' for their misgivings, and demand 'blind faith' in the Führer, who is 'infallible.' The reflective and educated are coming to perceive that Hitler and his circle have not a future policy, a home programme of betterment for families and individuals; they have only a list of territorial seizures in mind, coups which have a publicity value for the régime and are a subject for the following Nuremberg Congress. And it is not good enough. It becomes distinctly bad when a point comes at which a vital portion of Poland is sought because it contains people of German race, but can be had only through war, possibly two million casualties and grave political dangers.

Now in the Germany of the past, which our Victorian fathers idealised and freely borrowed from, rather similar ambitions often prevailed, but with this difference that there were criticisms and censures. Kant was the personal friend of the King of Prussia of that time, and reacted with moral force to treachery in high places. De Quincey says:

'Prussia, in the very noon of her aggressive movements against France, and in the mad ravings of her hellish menaces against Paris'—such as furnished but too colourable a plea to the atrocities that subsequently turned France into a shambles—'was playing the traitress to her engagements from the first—fixing her hungry eye upon the approaching wrecks of Poland; and in captivity to this fierce vulture instinct, as if scenting continually the odour of distant carrion in the East, altogether overlooking her great military interests in the West. To the stern integrity of Kant, all such double-dealing was hateful. That it should be imported to his own country, grieved him profoundly. But he was too sagacious not to suspect, and the evidences of deep Prussian treachery, which laid the foundations for sufferings so incalculable to all the states of Christendom, but to none so much as to Prussia herself from 1806 to 1813, finally became irresistible.'

Kant and other high-minded men went forward with their thought—putting humanity above the tribe and nation. Goethe's indifference to the French armies marching in is well known, and has been actually made a reproach to him by latter-day patriots unfit to tie

his shoe-laces. Morals and the idea of God mattered very much to men like Leibnitz and Lessing. There was something like a public opinion to witness against 'wickedness in high places.' Moreover, that was a Germany which could, without imputation of being unpatriotic, emulate France in some things, Britain in others. There was room in it for distinctively psychological and theological research; personality human and Divine was not displaced by communal ideology and its insatiable demands. The Schleirmachers, Schlegels, and Schellings were confirmed subjectivists, apt to underrate objective dogma and truth, but at least their errors, like their high interests, did honour to the human mind. They did not worship guns, explosives, the *kraft-prob*, and tribal egoism as a duty. They influenced our Scott, Coleridge, Wordsworth, De Quincey, Carlyle, George Eliot, and G. H. Lewes. Ideas were not so thoroughly searched and turned back at the frontier. German learning indeed, like the elephants of Pyrrhus, was often in danger of turning upon what it was intended to illumine and reinforce, and trampling it ponderously to death. Then, as now—but with a difference—it did not know when to say: Hold, enough. And yet what we owe to it! It is still struggling in the persons of Karl Adam, Peter Wundt, and Karl Barth, to make contact with the outer world on non-political ground—the ground of the spirit. Original art and science are at a record low ebb in the Third Reich, but religion is not quite completely muzzled yet. Christians can feel, what secular artists and writers there cannot, that over the wall there is a vast sympathetic field of like-minded thinking.

We wonder that our grandparents could see Germany as an idyll of Yule trees, the Prince Consort, evangelical pastors, mountain crucifixes, and fair-haired *madchens*, lighted Christmas candles and Black Forest toys, and that Tom Hood, Longfellow, and C. S. Calverly wrote at their most charming about the Rhine or Bavaria. But then it was a Germany as yet resisting Prussianisation. There was a flavour of France in Rhenish lands, of Italy and Switzerland in Bavaria and the little southern Duchies. It had given us Handel and Mendelssohn to become almost British composers. The Germans were politically conservative, more like ourselves than France:

they were a more restful picture to look upon—so it seemed. No one could foresee what in 1914 was called 'a mad dog of Europe,' and what the King termed 'this onslaught on civilisation.' The touch of unbalance and excess in German mentality did not seem of that kind, and there had usually been correctives. But when once an army became a people's pride, mascot, and achievement, other forces were unleashed. And here we come to a singular paradox.

Arnold Bennett in 1916 wrote, 'They are massed, trained, and ordered, but they are not a fighting people in the sense that the English, Scotch, Welsh, and Irish are fighting peoples.' 'Linesman' writing in 1908 in 'Blackwood' on 'German War' praised the organisation, obedience, and spectacular side, but foresaw fearful punishment if all this was put up against fierce Anglo-French resistance. Conrad in 1914 said: 'I have long observed the German genius has a hypnotising power over half-baked souls and half-lighted minds. There is an immense force of suggestion in highly-organised mediocrity. Had it not hypnotised half Europe?' Hear the British sentinel on guard over German prisoners: 'You can't help pitying 'em, sir; they're not a military lot like us, really.' There is no 'myth of the twentieth century' so hollow, so mysterious in its wide currency, as that man for man they are terrible to a foe. Field-Marshal French in dispatches in the first month of the war reported 'our cavalry asserted a complete personal ascendancy over enemy cavalry,' and our infantry showed 'incontestable superiority.' The air force later made the pace similarly, and so it will prove again whenever the 'wilder' (that is, less handled and tamed) Briton has the same encounter. What has encouraged the myth to those who have not gone into the matter at close range? Is it the physical bulk of Hans or Joachim, and the way his helmet and uniform sit on his well-fleshed frame? Is it the close ranking, the synchronising, the goose-step? Is it sheer numbers? These window-dressing externals—'accidents,' a scholastic philosopher would call them—have done their share in forming a mistaken estimate. Talk has done the rest; talk loud and insistent, and the naïve habitual concentration of the German mind on the Army and *Kriegspiel*. Latterly, certain quite safe military promen-

ades, by Europe's permission or connivance, into other people's homes, has helped to overawe the impossible and simple-minded further. But these were unopposed picnics. The moment a minor Power, Poland, remarked in answer to the familiar threat: 'Good. We await you'—Goliath retired to think again, and a novel lull happened in which talk, intrigue, vague menace, and rumour replaced force. There is no evidence that in a war of nerves, Germans are the people to win out; there is much to suggest that in such emotional attrition, of their own causing, the fable will be repeated:

'The man recovered of the bite—  
The dog it was that died.'

These imposing frameworks have a way of crumpling. They are much more emotional and suggestible than we. (It is their strength in music, in some modes of thinking, and in certain sorts of combination.) They take life much more earnestly; earnestness, unrelieved by British humour, fits of indifference, and devil-may-care, passes easily and often into morbidity. For proof, merely read Wedekind's 'Spring Awakening,' with its child-suicides; the lists of suicides at the approach of Nazidom into free cities; the conscientious, fervent conformity the 'Youth' show to any misty Paganism emitted by teacher; the solemn faces of the young at their new secularist liturgy; the present rush on aspirins and sedatives in chemists' shops; the over-stimulated imaginativeness shown in many air-raid drills; the chronic claustrophobia which imagines 'encirclement' and cries out illogically for other people's *lebensraum* when they have more of their own than they can fill without importing foreign labour. Note also the unstable rise and fall of confidence from week to week; on one date, 'Well, well,' exclaims Goebbels to an excited crowd, 'miracles happen daily, and now—the Colonies will be served up.' A week or two later, depression and bitterness reign; the tone has changed, and Britain is oppressing them. It is not healthy, nor normal. The preoccupation, too, with one subject, with one man and his intentions, is febrile and debilitating. No people which has to undergo such unremitting campaigning, teaching, training, and haranguing in the interests of empire is *fitted* by nature and genius for rule. The mere spectacle of a German



invasion into other territory, with its hordes of Gestapo, its new school-teachers and primers, *leiters* and civil servants, shows the same fatal overdoing of a thing; thoroughness defeating every useful end. With hopeless lack of humour, they complain of the ingratitude of the new subject population for such manifestations of care and order. Is there no one to see that it is methodical folly; and that a streak of *in*-efficiency, plus humour and the human touch, and the risk of tolerance, would effect far more? Something in much of this boasted order and organisation reeks of the class-room, the pedant, and the prig.

Hence, too, the fondness for theories and myths. As Heine said, 'they demand their history from the hands of the poet and not from the historian. The poets know this, and not without exultation they model at will the memories of a whole people,' so that Heine sketched a type he encountered as a result: 'He represents the love of the Fatherland without being in the least dangerous. He prates about Arminius the Cherusker and his lady Thusnelda, as though he were their fair-haired descendant. He steadily cherishes his German patriotic hatred against the French Babylon, against the inventor of soap, against all men who have respectable noses.' They have always been an extremely *subjective* race, building a thought- or dream-world of their own. 'I don't want to understand outer facts,' said Karl Marx, a typical dogmatic German; 'I want to change them.' Kipling's elderly German with 'much ego in his cosmos' is a fact still. The tendency to fabricate an alternative mind-world and live in it is old—it is in the *Nibelungenlied*, which for Germans is no literary curiosity like our Anglo-Saxon epics, but a present world; it is in Hegel and all the 'system' makers; in Grimm; in Strauss's own and altered Christ in his 'Leben Jesu'; in the mysticism of Jacob Behmen and Meister Eckhardt; in Luther's *willed* rather than thought-out theology and his phobias against Greek, classics, Erasmus, the Pope, St. James, and the moderate reformers like Zwingli and Melancthon. It is in Nietzsche's note of strain—'Man must be *surpassed*,' 'I *will* illusion,' 'Become *hard*, my brethren,' 'Woman is the warrior's recreation,' 'Myself I sacrifice unto my love—and my neighbour as myself'; and we know to

what this titanism and mania brought Nietzsche, and will bring nations, for it is against the modesty of nature, against the unconscious intelligence of man and the cosmos. The *genuine* heroes do not deal in rhodomontade; they are cool fellows, when not on duty; they resemble Wordsworth's 'Happy Warrior.' This other-worldism is in Schopenhauer with his 'World as Will and Idea,' in von Hartmann's 'Philosophy of the Unconscious,' in Ludendorff's Nordic Paganism, in Rosenberg's occult soil-and-blood mumbo-jumbo; and in the earnest abnormalities of Youth to-day leaping over fires as part of an unhealthy earth-ritual.

Rosenberg in effect says, 'You others complain that you see no truth in our Mythos. You are not meant to. It is ours, and visible only to us—it is Truth-for-us.' Now these coloured glasses have subjective advantages, but this great external handicap, that the wearer does not see other men and things for what they are. Therefore, he performs prodigies up to a point, and there he steps out into space—and crashes. Especially is it gullible in diplomacy, in blank incuriosity about others' feelings and reactions. Repeatedly we have witnessed this failure to infer the human obvious. Schopenhauer praises the English for their 'common' sense—their sense of facts, their empiricism and realism, and commends it instead of the grandiose self-deception of his countrymen. But a national temper is not cured by the advice of a sage or two. Gigantic wish-thinking soon takes the helm and is not easily dispossessed. The same trait is responsible likewise for the German temptation (which he disposes of by succumbing to it) to take a mile when given an inch: and his extreme difficulty in playing some games fairly, or losing a game. Intermittently through history Germany, and Prussia before her, have seized or proposed the seizure of a neighbour's territory, with this proviso, that 'we will guarantee what remains.' Nor does she understand the alarm the proposal awakens. 'What! refuse our guarantee? *Dumm!*' is the reaction; failing to see that the other party's morality is outraged and his confidence eroded.

One doubts the utility of the British and other propaganda, though it is a duty to go forward with it. Germans immediately consider as calumny whatever does

not agree with the 'official German truth.' They cannot doubt their authorities—till the authorities doubt themselves. They trusted absolutely the Kaiser, till he abdicated: and that action dissolved the very morale of millions. Their *leader* had absconded, and they were nothing.

Here, then, in Europe's middle, is a singular phenomenon; a people many of whom are imaginatively and philosophically gifted, and again, at the other extreme, apt at material applied science. But the territory *between*—the practical art of understanding, managing, and reassuring *men*—is lacking. It is defect of tact; of the social consciousness, of the understanding of differing persons. To what else but the want of human realism and common sense can we ascribe the habit of announcing in advance, with flourishes, their plans at others' expense? Is not, for instance, 'Mein Kampf' the loudest bell ever hung on any cat? Is it not, for all its hate and Machiavellian cynicism, the *silliest* book ever committed? It should all have been kept under Herr Hitler's hat, till wanted. As it is, the most heartless advertisement of the Big Bad Wolf is amplified by the million in the most *unsubtle* manner. Is there then some irremovable, irremediable crudity in the otherwise complex German make-up? What can the Propaganda Minister's object be in declaring the other day: 'We are a young nation, and the young have no use for morals'? Surely it is *the* one thought which should be locked away in his breast; while he should 'smile, and smile, and smile, and be a villain'? It was the same in the years before 1914, when their public men were telling us, garrulously, in tones lyric, scientific, philosophic, mocking, or angry, just what Siegfried was going to do to all of us degenerates.

There seems no escape from the conclusion that the German is not a good dissembler nor a good mixer. He must say, in a raised voice, all that is in his mind. And what is in his naïve mind is something so raw and simple that more experienced, civilised, and mannerly races cannot believe such simplicity exists—and read into it shades of meaning alien to the Herr Professor or the General von X. The toil on our part is supererogatory. He is what he appears and means what he says. The fairy godmother has given to some, at the cradle, every

gift save one, the gift of living with others on a basis of co-operative equality, with give and take, suspension of one's optimum wishes in view of further gain, and the knowledge that half a loaf given is safer than a whole loaf snatched.

If character is destiny, so is some hole or flaw in character. That flaw mattered little in the older Germany, which was not cut off by itself from foreign educative influence, and which had not a programme of domination. German strength lies precisely in the realms of thought, peace, industry, and domestic order; its weakness in world-adventures among ideas, types, and forces which are subtler, older, and stronger. Liberty, for instance, even where only a sentiment, a desperate hope or memory, is a dynamite which will burst all imposed bonds. Christianity, taunted or suppressed, will wear down the hostile machine as the mere winds and rains of the atmosphere will rust a tractor. Such forms of strenuousness as the Reich is living under usually crack under greater strain or shock. A fixation is not strength, though it simulates strength. Evolution is against Sparta or one-idea régimes. No part of the human race which has known Christianity, which has enjoyed freedom of thought and the views of the other party can merely drop them, go behind them, and decide to remake itself pagan and the 'boss-nation.' Rule is not apportioned that way. Germany is in too great a hurry: she requires a century or more of experience, psychology, easy-going natural evolution, and the trust and liking of others, before she is even a candidate for the position of *primus inter pares*.

We can be calm about the ultimate end of the transient Third Reich, which does not consist of political adults and is not led by psychological adults. It has reached a cul-de-sac, and has met various things harder than itself—harder, maturer, subtler. The revolutionary tension and suppressions are bad for its health, yet could be ended by the most ordinary common-sense, by the mere recognition of an honest negotiator in Chamberlain, the possibilities of conference, and the stupidity of their hopeless arms race. Christianity will one day attend the obsequies of another ephemeral Nationalism; only the date is unknown.

W. J. BLYTON.

## Art. 2.—A PLEA FOR SOCIAL HISTORY.

NEARLY a century ago Carlyle voiced the complaint of many readers in face of the histories which followed each other in regular succession from the press. 'After interpreting the Greeks and Romans for a thousand years, let us now try our own a little. . . . What all want to know is the condition of our fellow men; and, strange to say, it is the thing of all least understood, or to be understood as matters go.' If we could recall him to life and plead that 'we have reformed that indifferently with us,' would he not answer 'O! reform it altogether'? Our school books have indeed improved greatly in the last twenty years; the so-called 'Piers Plowman Histories' are specially commendable. But here, as in every other department of civilisation, improvement needs to come concurrently at both ends; and the universities seem still far behind the times. Where we might most hope to see directest daylight we are disappointed. If we would console ourselves with Clough's 'But westward, look, the land is bright,' we must first confess with him 'in front the sun climbs slow—how slowly!' A minority of teachers are doing admirable work, and one, turned examiner, has received permission to set social questions in each of his papers. But how little can one man do, or even half a dozen, in the face of a more or less stereotyped system!

It is not that our examination system is essentially vicious. Much nonsense is sometimes talked about the absurdity of written examinations and the superiority of other methods. During the War I had in my class an able Jesuit, who had already taken his Ph.D. in Austria. I once said to him apologetically: 'I am afraid you may look upon our Tripos system as rather clumsy and barbarous.' To my agreeable surprise, he answered: 'Quite the contrary: it seems to work very well.' This was the more impressive because he himself failed to get full justice under it. Partly on account of his slower and less readable English, partly from the handicap of 'not knowing the ropes,' he missed the First Class which his attainments deserved. But he felt that, on the whole, the system did find out the best men. And, in further talk, he bore out the experience of many army-crammers



of the past : men who worked in face of what, however it may now be, was then one of the clumsiest and absurdest examinations in the world. So long as the system is honest in its own way—and that, at any rate, the Woolwich and Sandhurst examinations were—it does at the worst discover and register one of the most important factors in human life : that is, will-power. The schoolboy who has sufficient character to plod on for years at subjects stupidly tested and often defectively taught, despising the thing from the point of view of common sense, but facing it as a necessary ditch to be crossed, is the man whom a nation wants among its leaders. Originally nobody could get into the army without a preliminary examination in spelling. One candidate said to his master, my friend : ‘ This is my last chance for the Prelim. before my Final. If for the fourth time I get ploughed in spelling, I am done for ; but, if I have the luck to pass, I shall be among the first three in the Final.’ He had that luck, and proceeded (I believe) to pass second on the Sandhurst list. Another, whom I knew very well, was so cacographous (if the word may be coined) that, having learned how to spell *headache*, he wrote *acheorn* for the fruit of an oak. Yet, by herculean labour, he got through at last. He kept an enormous list of past mistakes on his bedroom table, and learned them by heart as he dressed. At football he showed the same unconquerable pluck ; and I have often thought that if, in some desperate emergency, a good fairy would grant me to evoke some spirit from the past, I would call upon that boy to stand by me. The examination, like the machine, having once been invented, cannot be de-invented. Human nature employs both one and the other sometimes well, sometimes ill. But, even in the worst cases, there is often a divinity which shapes our ends. Yet it still remains one of the most pressing tasks of civilisation to ensure the correct and easy working of all this machinery, and to direct it with the most intelligent aim. And the universities from above, even as the schools from below, have still far to go before we arrive at an educational system which will satisfy modern requirements. There is an insistent demand ; let us not leave it to chance to produce the supply. Having practically begun my class-life at a French lycée and finished it at

a German university, I know by experience that British education has certain great advantages, easier to feel than to describe. But few will deny that its weak point is that of over-confidence in the virtue of 'muddling through.' Those of us who were brought up to the orthodox politico-economical ideas of the 'seventies have mostly been converted by hard facts to interference, occasional at first but more and more frequent now, with the 'natural' course of things. The nation expects nowadays that every Government, whether 'conservative' or 'progressive,' should keep its eyes upon the ground and interfere at need to seize upon some healthy popular impulse and nurse it to maturity. The reading public does indeed want trustworthy Social History, yet is seldom able to test its accuracy. The past (as things go now) is a happy-hunting-ground for every writer who has sufficient imagination and literary skill to clothe it with real human interest. For this, no previous experience is needed. Yet, officially, Social History is now under the same comparative neglect from which History in general suffered until living memory.

That story has been told by F. W. Maitland, than whom none could have done it better. He wrote :

'The attempt to teach History, if thereby be meant a serious endeavour to make historical study one of the main studies of the universities, is very new. We can admit that it has attained the manly estate of one-and-twenty years and little more. But not much more. Some of those who watched its cradle are still among us, are still active and still hopeful.'

In 1884 the one solitary Cambridge Professorship of History (Regius) was supplemented by a Chair of Ecclesiastical and, in 1898, of Ancient History. In 1935 a chair was founded for Economic and in 1937 for Mediæval History. Thus we have now five : at Oxford there are twelve (two of which are of Ancient History), with seven University Readers and sixteen permanent lecturers. This is an immense advance for History within the last forty years : and no reader of the writings of any one of the present occupants can complain that they do not help him greatly to 'know the condition of our fellow men' in the past. Yet much more remains to be done.

Though none among this regiment of teachers is personally dead to the appeal of Social History, yet that which is everybody's business is nobody's business. Let me give concrete evidence : first, of the ancient morass from which we are slowly struggling in our schools ; and then of the struggle as it goes on at the present moment. We may then realise how urgently common sense is crying for still further improvement.

My first story is from direct experience in the summer of 1886. The scene is a well-known school, of special football fame. The youngest and most recent master on the staff, who had come honourably near to a university Blue for his bowling, had also spent enough spare time upon History to scrape through for his degree. He set a paper for the lowest form after the most approved university style. One question I can remember almost textually : ‘“ The Age of Elizabeth was the brightest period of English Literature.” Illustrate this by quotations and examples.’ Only one boy attempted the question : a model boy who knew his book by heart, and who wrote : ‘ The Age of Elizabeth was sixty-nine. She wore red hair and false teeth, and is described by Hentzner, a German who saw her on his travels, as . . . , etc.’

Our cricketing colleague showed this round as a gem, sublimely unconscious of the floodlight it cast upon his own methods. Here is another case from a not much later year (1899). The Headmasters in Conference were debating the urgent need for setting their English teaching in order. Here, one of the oldest and ablest uttered a note of solemn warning : ‘ Not seldom ’ (he said) ‘ the English lesson justifies Mr Balfour’s prayer that the schoolmaster might not spread his blighting influence over the fair fields of English literature.’ This is one of the rare incidents which, in those solemn assemblies, made the whole world kin. We groundlings felt as in presence of a group of engineers assembled round a locomotive to debate how the thing should be worked. One, bolder than the rest, is about to mount the footplate ; but at once the cry goes up : ‘ Take your blighting hand off that there engine ! ’

These, again, were the barbarous days when those officers were being formed of whom afterwards a North-umberland Fusilier, fresh home among the wounded from

Mons, said to me: 'Our officers, sir, they didn't know whether the man was a Frenchman or a German.'\* They were the days when (mainly by mistaken headmasterly influence over the Civil Service Commission, but very greatly also through official stupidity among the Civil Service examiners themselves) 'scholastic' French and German were being required from candidates, as apart from the 'colloquial' French and German which a youth could attain best by spending a few months in a foreign country. This 'scholastic' knowledge included questions on literary history and on scientific etymology, of which the examiners themselves were sometimes ignorant. On one occasion, at least, the candidate might have gone up a couple of places on the list by giving an entirely false derivation for *Fontainebleau*. Those 'scholastic' questions did all that human stupidity could do to wreck the examination. Even those on literary history only gave one fresh advantage to the 'crammer,' who, being always a person of shrewd common sense, never had the least difficulty in adjusting himself to every fresh tortuosity of syllabus designed to favour the public schools. It is well that such experiences should be put upon record while men are still alive who can tell them from first-hand knowledge. Thus alone can we fully measure the advance which education has made in the past fifty years, and look forward to the future with greater hope and vigour of resolve.

For, indeed, the advance has been very great. Yet here, as often, it is the most zealous and able teachers who are most convinced that the pace needs to be quickened, at almost any cost. Mr R. H. Snape, who wrote the 1066-1300 volume of those 'Piers Plowman Histories' edited by Miss E. H. Spalding, kindly allows me to quote, from his own experience as a teacher and examiner, the

---

\* In 1900, when we were co-operating with France in China, a question in the Commons (July 6) elicited from Mr Austen Chamberlain that, out of our whole fleet there, in addition to three qualified interpreters, only twelve were 'said to speak French' and two German. The Headmasters' Conference of 1881, in its formal report to the War Office, began one sentence with: 'Assuming, therefore, that colloquial French is considered necessary as a technical accomplishment for a British officer, although a large proportion of officers on foreign service have few or no opportunities of turning it to account . . .'

details which I print here, by courtesy of the Secretary to the Local Examinations Syndicate at Cambridge :

' (1) A girl took the Cambridge School Certificate soon after the new syllabus admitting Social History came into force. She did poor work in most of the subjects, but reached the "very good" standard in history. This excited great astonishment in her school, and apparently in the neighbourhood; and her headmistress wrote to say that she really thought some mistake must have been made. So the Syndicate sent her script to me, as chief examiner, for a report. It was indeed a very good effort. But then, though she had been taught political history without much effect, as her teachers' incredulity showed, she happened to have been interested in Social History. She confined herself almost entirely to the social questions, and I was able to confirm the examiner's marks.

' (2) Here are some statistics from the first Cambridge School Certificate examination in which Social History appeared. They cover only about a tenth, I think, of the candidates; but perhaps a rather smaller fraction. However, the scripts were taken at random just as they reached me, and are probably representative.\*

*British and European History : 1688-1914*

379 candidates, answering 5 questions each as a rule, sent in 1873 answers (out of a possible 1895).

*English Political History (10 questions)*

(1) 1688-1830 . . .	247
(2) 1830-1914 . . .	247
	— 494

*European History (10 questions)*

(1) 1688-1830 . . .	247
(2) 1830-1914 . . .	304
	— 551

*English Social History (8 questions)*

(1) 1688-1830 . . .	361
(2) 1830-1914 . . .	288
	— 649

---

\* It should be clearly understood, however, that this is only a single case, and the samples, though taken quite at random, may by chance have been not fairly representative. It would be very interesting if a similar analysis were made every year, to eliminate the element of pure chance. (G. G. C.)



'In terms of percentages, we see that English Political History, with 10 questions, scored 26.5 per cent. of the answers, and European Political History, with 10 questions, scored 29.5 per cent.; while Social History, with only 8 questions, scored 34.5 per cent.\* That the social answers were often poor meant simply that the subject had not been taught. The natural interest was there, and showed itself even when prudence might have told the candidates to stick to what most time had been spent over in school.

'(3) As for my own experience, I spent fifteen years teaching History to the upper forms (from 14 on) of a school where the syllabus was completely dominated by London Matriculation (in which History is completely political); where it was a matter of vital concern to most boys to pass London Matriculation; where History in the lower forms was taught by anyone; and where nobody had any authority over the History teaching but the headmaster—a mathematician, succeeded by a classic. All that I could do was to introduce Social History text-books and steal what little time I could. I need not have worried: most boys read the Social History text-books for themselves in their own time. An old boy called last week and said: "Do you know, sir, the only school book I ever read out of school was that 'Piers Plowman' book you wrote." He was being pleasant, I know, but he was a normal sort of boy at school, a scientist and mathematician, who is now a civil engineer. Moreover, I promptly held a little examination without his knowing it; he had read the book—and I am sure he did not read it in school, for I wouldn't use my own book there, and merely put a copy in the library—and he still remembered it after the three years of taking a London Science degree and three or four years of practical experience as an engineer.

'The natural interest is there, I am certain, if the school would take advantage of it. What is wanted, apart from inciting the schools, is a supply of text-books written in the right way—not potted Economic History, but something which, even if all the ground is not covered, keeps human beings still human beings. Then let the examiners follow the text-books.'

Those details and reflections are from a man qualified to speak not only by his university achievements—a First Class in Modern Languages and in both parts of

---

\* The other 9.5 per cent. were 'short-point' answers, with political and social points mixed.

the History Tripos, together with the Lightfoot Scholarship and Prince Consort Essay, published by the University Press—but also by ‘the little healthy humiliations of a schoolmaster’s life,’ to quote the significant phrase which I once heard from one who had been Senior Classic and eminent even among the best of Victorian headmasters: C. J. Vaughan, of Harrow. Most History teachers will probably agree with Mr Snape that, whether the average History class-book is or is not the right thing for Eton and Harrow, it certainly is not for the boys and girls of our county council secondary schools. There, the pupil has little political background. At breakfast, or anywhere in his home, he hears nothing much, especially at first hand, about our great national interests or our national literature. It is only at fifteen or sixteen that he knows enough of present-day politics, domestic or foreign, to form a tiny nucleus round which the politics of the past may crystallise. On the other hand, for the comprehension of bygone men who, like his own father, were agriculturists or shopmen or mechanics, he is equipped by nature and by his present-day environment. There is no stable foundation for any real comprehension of the past, apart from what the pupil is learning instinctively in his own home or his own streets. In the earlier stages we must speak to him in his own language.

Sound education, therefore, calls for a change in the examinations for which the pupils of our secondary schools must work. But these depend upon the universities: therefore the universities must be converted. At Cambridge the question has been raised definitely more than once, and with special publicity during the discussion on a grace for the creation of two new Professorships (Mediæval History and Comparative Philology). It was urged that Social History had a claim prior even to the former; and this was supported by a formal representation from the whole Faculty of English.

That Faculty had, from its very inception, an essential interest in the matter. Without thereby criticising others, we yet feel that there may well be one university, at least, in which Literature should be studied for Literature’s sake, and without compulsory reference to what may almost be called the palæontology of letters. In place of that, the Faculty laid emphasis upon Social

History: thus there was an understanding that this should be studied all through in connection with the literature of the period. It was felt that, for the full understanding of Chaucer's poetry, even more can be found in the English life of Chaucer's day, in city or in countryside, than in the original language of Beowulf and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, masterpieces though they be in their way. Again, for the appreciation of Malory it seemed more important to grasp the code of *amour courtois* in the twelfth century (when those legends took their classical form), together with English social conditions during the Wars of the Roses (when that old wine was poured into new bottles), than to have studied carefully the linguistic transformations in our language during that long interval. Therefore the second examination paper upon English Literature under the new scheme (1920) contained, in the mediæval section, 16 questions, among which the candidates were free to choose 6 as they liked, neglecting all the rest. Of the 16 questions, 7 were purely literary, 3 social, and the rest half-and-half. It would have been more logical to prescribe that this choice must include one or two of the social questions; but that was not done. The practical result has been that the majority of candidates ignore all but the easiest among the questions which are not directly concerned with Literature.

For here the conditions are very different from those which Mr Snape describes in the schools. The university student in English feels, rightly, that his main concern is Literature, pure and simple. In that field he has to read hard; and it is quite natural that, in so far as the examination will permit, he should follow his own natural tastes, apart from or contrary to the solemn decisions of the critics. Left to himself, he would read little of either Criticism or Social History: he would browse at will. But the History and Theory of Criticism must needs be read—Aristotle, Sidney, Dryden, Pope, Johnson, Wordsworth, Coleridge, and Matthew Arnold—since almost every question implies some knowledge of that. For Criticism is the scientific or quasi-scientific element serving to stiffen a subject which would otherwise be one of pure taste. Gold needs an alloy of copper to make it sufficiently workable: Literature needs an admixture

of Criticism to make it sufficiently examinable. Criticism, therefore, our free literary browser cannot escape from ; but he does not willingly accept a further burden of facts and deductions not directly relevant to his chosen subject. He must needs be trained for the saddle, but he would rather not have to go in harness. Therefore, Social History is shirked by the majority, except in its simplest forms. Yet those who know little of Chaucer beyond his text miss a great deal of his poetic intention.

Moreover, there is another very natural reason. No great change in our complex system of education is likely to be immediately successful : *nemo repente historicus fit*. As things go at present, it is rare to find English Literature teachers who are willing to accept full responsibility for questions of Social History. The man who is otherwise admirably equipped may well show his wisdom in avoiding questions which he himself could formulate only tentatively, and the answers to which he would correct with still greater hesitation. There are few more embarrassing moments for an examiner than when he is compelled to ask himself : 'Is this candidate highly original, or just boldly imaginative?' Social History is a no less specialised branch than Literary or Economic or Constitutional History. A man may be highly educated in any one of those four fields, and quite pardonably ignorant of the rest, except for the purpose of ordinary dinner-table talk. Alone among those four, the Social has never received separate and official dignity. There are few books dealing explicitly and exclusively with this subject ; and, above all, there is no professional recognition. *Above all*, we may say, not as assuming that no study can be healthy without such recognition, but just on the common-sense principle that he who desires the end must also desire the means. If we desire that our pupils should learn certain things, we must have examiners who possess a sure touch for those things. If we have none such already, we must invent them. Our complicated educational machinery cannot produce definite results unless it comprises some member definitely adapted for such results. If it is right to mechanise our universities at all, and to give them the power over schools which they do exert now *de facto* through their examination systems, then it must be of supreme importance to perfect

this machinery. It seems evident that, in practice, *laissez-faire* does not produce many adequate Social Historians. If Carlyle was right, supply ran far short of the demand a century ago; and some of us feel that his words apply with painful truth even to the present day. Certainly there is no such systematic supply as we need if we are to pass this knowledge from the universities, as from a fountain-head, down through the schools to our people at large. And, for lack of such knowledge, we have an electorate shockingly ignorant of many things which belong to its peace. The country may be confronted at any moment, suddenly and unexpectedly, with some crucial question, most living to our forefathers, yet buried now under the changes brought down by the stream of time. It may be almost a matter of life and death that men should know how this was faced in the past, with what measure of success or failure. Yet of those facts even well-educated and thoughtful men are often as ignorant as a babe unborn. All that was once learned from bitter experience, at immense cost, has now run to waste. It is no man's direct business to preserve human experience for future use.

One striking example will suffice. In the twinkling of an eye, compulsory military service has passed from the realm of impossibilities to the realm of inexorables and inescapables. The Prime Minister on Monday tells us 'how abhorred in my imagination it is! My gorge rises at it.' The same, on Tuesday, proclaims it as the head-stone of the corner. It is to the immense credit of the country that this violent *volte face* did not turn it hopelessly dizzy. For, at the very best, we must now extemporise things which should have taken years to mature. Whatever may be the rights of the present matter, as between pacifist (or parapacifist) and militarist (or paramilitarist), it must be appallingly wrong that both sides should be fighting in the dark. For nearly all Britons are blankly ignorant of some things which a French historian, Siméon Luce, told us in 1882, and of others which anybody can discover for himself by taking a cheap return ticket to Switzerland, Holland, or Scandinavia. Luce pointed out how our immunity from serious invasion after the Conquest and our immense superiority over the French for more than a hundred years were

founded upon our compulsory militia system : ' the name of *conscription* is very modern, but the thing is ancient, precisely among the people who know least of it nowadays '—that is, in England. That truth has not filtered, even yet, into our official histories. We have a great ' History of the Art of War ' which practically ignores this vital lesson. Traill's ' Social England,' in many ways a book of first-rate value, tells equally little. Moreover, thirty years ago the truth was not only ignored but actually contested by a learned Oxford specialist, H. B. George. Our strength in the French wars was due (he argued) not to our enrolling our whole population, but just ' to the long-bow '—as though that admirable weapon had been like Mr Winkle's gun, warranted to go off of its own accord and to kill something ! Why has not a question of this importance been threshed out long ago ? For one obvious reason, that it is very naturally unpopular : and therefore (as a distinguished statesman has put it to me frankly in explanation of the general silence) ' it would be political suicide ' for any party to raise it. One M.P. did, in fact, commit such political suicide by raising it shortly before 1914, in response to Lord Roberts's appeal. But the fact that this appeal should have been treated so much as a mere party question is a disgrace to British historiography. Only one official historian came into the field, and he one of the least prominently placed : Professor J. A. Cramb, of Queen's College, London.

At this point someone will object : ' These are acutely controversial matters ; you are importing controversy into History.' On the contrary, we are importing historical facts as a corrective for imaginative controversy. Where there is life there must be controversy : whether good, bad, or indifferent. Where does controversy begin ? As defined by the Oxford English Dictionary, controversy is ' The action of disputing or contending one with another ; dispute, debate, contention.' It begins, in effect, less in the man who disputes a disputable statement than with him who has made that statement : and how many hours pass in any serious talk of any kind before some more or less disputable statement is made ? The discussion may become long : too often also it becomes heated, on one side or on both. But, provided that no



undue heat is imported, the longer the better ; for temperate discussion is one of the things that distinguish man from brute, and civilised from uncivilised man. Next to the organisation of thought, the organisation of argument is one of the foundations of all progress : it is for such work that our universities exist. Therefore what we need is not less discussion, but more, so long as it is carried on decently and in order. The reason why discussion, under the name of controversy, has earned its evil reputation is not far to seek. Men dislike that word not because they repudiate the true essence of controversy—the exchange of plea and counterplea between two parties who do not happen to see eye to eye—but because it so often degenerates into a mere unconscientious dispute. Here, again, we come across the same melancholy fact ; human frailty has caused an innocent word to pass into an almost uniformly invidious sense. *Disputare*, by derivation, means simply ‘to think diversely’ : a thing which is not only universal among men, but most laudable and necessary, until men become so angelic as to think all alike and all right. In its ordinary classical sense, *disputare* means ‘to debate,’ without any invidious implication whatever : it may be used of a man’s quiet and silent ponderings in his own mind. In all human disputations, therefore, the thing to be avoided is not the mere continuance of plea and counterplea. Again, even prolixity is rather to be welcomed than avoided, so long as each party is careful not to waste time in empty words or trivialities ; or (worst of all) to come under Goldsmith’s ‘even though vanquished, he could argue still.’ The debaters may too often part without any modification of thought on either side so far as the main subject of discussion is concerned. Yet, even so, given ordinary self-control, it is practically certain that each will have learned something positive from the other ; and it is quite certain that each will have gone some way to clear his own thoughts. Everything depends here upon civilised method ; that is, upon proper control ; and, first of all, upon self-control. But, in this matter as elsewhere, may not method gain by a certain amount of control from above ?

We may find a helpful analogy in the first chapter of  
Vol. 273.—No. 542.

P

the late Professor Unwin's classical 'Gilds of London.' He points out how, in England, the instinctive human spirit of association helped the Gild to grow up, and the Gild did much to shape the Town, and the Town the State. Thus he shows how natural and long and deep has been the process to which we owe our present-day freedom: those liberties which are even more precious than the peace and the elaborate governmental machinery which had reigned over Europe during the later centuries of the Roman Empire. In one sense, therefore, during those Middle Ages in which Europe was rebuilt out of the ruins of Rome, the Gilds (that is, the trades unions) made the Towns, and the Towns made the State. Yet that, as he points out, would be a very exaggerated oversimplification. He asks: May we not almost as truly reverse the statement, and say that the State formed the Town, and the Town the Gild? For, 'in all the intricate processes of social construction, lordship has been nearly as important a factor as fellowship.' From the strictly legal point of view, we may almost say that the authorities, from above, said *You shall combine* as emphatically as the traders or handiworkers said *We will combine*. 'There have always been forces above meeting and cooperating with forces from below.'

Thus, then, may we perhaps hope to effect the sore-needed improvement in educational method: the work should proceed simultaneously at both ends. The multitude should contribute its share, yet the authorities should not only approve, but lead the way. Public opinion ought to grow far more tolerant of controversy in itself and far more intolerant of bad temper or untruth in controversy. If it is unreasonable to contemplate a future society in which all men will think together, yet it is mere common sense to work for a day when the historian who, having published a false and directly disprovable statement of fact, refuses confession and amendment, should be treated socially as if he had cheated at cards, and almost as if he had played the same trick with a cheque. Among vertebrates, hard bones and elastic flesh are formed simultaneously; and, in society, natural impulse combines with controlling forces to work the deepest and most permanent psychological changes.

Let us apply this to our present problem. The public

wants Social History: and there is a considerable, but irregular, supply under our present *laissez-faire* policy. But for the increase of that supply, and especially for the purging of its baser or even deleterious elements, we need far more regulation than has been attempted up to the present moment. If some wealthy benefactor would found in one of our universities (and preferably, perhaps, in one of the most recent and up-to-date) a Chair of Social History, that very act would give effective reality to many things which have long existed only in the realm of ideas. The proper study of mankind is man. The mere fact that this study is so difficult and so uncertain, in comparison with the study of test-tubes and chemical elements, is a strong reason why it should be seriously attempted at this stage of civilisation, when the test-tube has made such immense progress and has done so much to transform the world that the faint-hearted are beginning to shrink from Physical Science as from a Frankenstein-monster. The way to lay a ghost of that kind is not to shut it up in a cupboard or turn away from the sight of it, but to confront it with the reality of an effort as great as or greater than its own. It is far more difficult to analyse man's thoughts and actions, and to infer future behaviour from them, than from the behaviour of atoms and electrons. But the mere attempt raises the human mind; to shrink from it is to betray a great cause, to accept intellectual defeatism. Let us not talk of the problem as insoluble until it has been fairly attacked. The Chairs of Economic History do indeed provide something of what is needed: but, by general consent, Economic History is as one-sided as all other studies are apt to become, and the attempt to treat man as an economic animal has been responsible for as many half-baked social theories as the exaggerated emphasis upon Aristotle's dictum that man is a political animal. Even though there were no more value in the Social Historian than that his own prejudices cut across those of the economist and the politician, he would yet play a useful part in the general intellectual advance. I have heard a distinguished economist, in reference to our remote ancestors, cut argument short with 'We shall never understand those men'! To this we may oppose the firm conviction that something real can be done by those who

have real faith ; and that, even if there exists no sure science of Sociology, this lays all the stronger moral compulsion upon us to work for it, even as the alchemist worked for what we now call Chemistry. For here is one field, at least, in which nature herself calls us to war : a war hampered by no conscientious objections and offering victory to all but the man who gives up fighting.

Give, then, to one man among the many students who are already fit for it, the privilege of spending himself, without extraneous calls and anxieties, upon mankind's study of man. Everywhere already we have Professorships of Anthropology, for study among the tribes overseas ; why not, then, among those primitive folk also from whom we ourselves are lineally descended ? Such a professor would know, concerning battles or political intrigues or intricacies of laws and constitutions, only as much as is necessary for his job : only what any university teacher ought to know about the events and thoughts of his own and other days. But, behind and beneath all that, he will study how the multitude lived and grew. He will show us, with Milton, an eagle-like England ' mewing her mighty youth ' ; and not only with Milton's emphasis upon resistance to open tyranny and upon the purchase of future liberty with present tears and blood. He will show us a less conspicuous but even more real tragedy, in the elevating Greek sense of that word : the great drama of Man's fight against Circumstance.

G. G. COULTON.

### Art. 3.—THE CHAOS IN PROPRIETARY MEDICINE LAW.

In his Budget speech on April 25, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Simon, made the sweeping proposal to abolish the taxation of 'patent' or proprietary medicines. His proposal caused a sensation in an industry which has grown and prospered exceedingly since it was founded in 1783 by the imposition of what in effect was a tax on quackery. It was not surprising, therefore, to find that the threat of so great an upheaval roused a vigorous opposition during the debate on the Finance Bill on June 22. The Chancellor bowed to the storm and agreed to postpone the provision for a year to allow time for a satisfactory scheme to be formulated. To say that the proposed abolition of medicine stamp duties is a retrograde step and contrary to the whole trend of public health legislation during the past twenty-five years—if it were to mean a freer trade in drugs—is to state an obvious truth. There are so many interests involved that no one can say with certainty what exactly would happen. Yet the question which has remained unanswered for so long must be faced. Can the proprietary medicine trade be allowed to function in its present disjointed fashion, yielding a diminishing revenue? There are, according to current estimates, 15,000 pharmacists and 150,000 licensed vendors acting as distributors and a host of others clamouring for a share in the profits of distributing those articles of commerce with so steady a sale. If not, what is the alternative?

The original object in imposing a tax on proprietary medicines was simply to raise revenue. In 1783 Lord John Cavendish, Chancellor of the Exchequer, when the country was financially crippled after the wars in France, Spain, and the United States, proposed to tax medicines made and sold by any person who had not been 'bred to the profession of doctors, etc.' He estimated that 15,000*l.* would be produced from the cost of the licence and from a duty of 8 per cent. on the medicine. The Medicine Stamp Act which followed became law on July 11, 1783. In this Act the addition was made that exempted persons were to include those who for three years before the passing of the Act had kept

a shop for the sale of drugs and medicines only. Two years later a second Act followed, to be replaced by still later Acts in 1802, 1803, 1804, 1812, and by amending Acts in 1815 and 1833. The Medicine Stamp Act, 1812, contained a schedule of 550 remedies to be taxed, and this schedule is still in force although nearly all the articles specified in the schedule are no longer in existence. There were special exemptions which are worthy of mention: (1) drugs appearing in the Book of Rates by Sir Harbottle Grimstone, Bt. (1660). Among these were drugs and chemicals as imported in the reign of Charles II; (2) entire drugs; (3) known, admitted, and approved remedies. It is this last-named exemption which has brought about the present impasse in carrying out legal requirements.

The term 'patent' medicine is by long usage and custom applied to proprietary remedies. But this description should be reserved strictly to describe medicines which are the subject of letters patent actually in force. There are, to-day, comparatively few proprietary medicines which can be correctly described as 'patent' medicines. Obviously, from the manufacturer's viewpoint it is advantageous for the association of the words 'patent' and 'medicine' to continue in the public mind, since it implies that a special process is followed in compounding the remedy. Just as the term 'patent' may be held to suggest a superiority in the remedy, so quack medicine is associated with all that is worthless and indeed fraudulent. There is, however, another danger in that a medicine may contain an ingredient definitely injurious and continue unchallenged for a time. This possibility has been rendered less likely thanks to recent legislation. But it may be recalled that, some years ago, a national newspaper conducted a campaign against a remedy which, it was alleged, was definitely injurious and practically drove it off the market. The risk is inseparable from secret remedies and it constitutes an argument for compulsory registration of all formulas.

The modern history of proprietary medicines may be said to date from 1903, when as a result of the *Farmer v. Glyn-Jones* case the 'known, admitted, and approved' exemption in favour of certain persons, including pharmacists, which had lain dormant for ninety years, was established for the first time. Mr (afterwards Sir)



William Glyn-Jones, himself a pharmacist and later the Member of Parliament for Stepney, brought a test case which confirmed the right to persons specified in the Medicine Stamp Act, 1812, to sell these remedies unstamped. 'Known, admitted, and approved' medicines represented the traditional remedies made by surgeons, apothecaries, and chemists and exempted from duty in the original statutes. As such they were now clearly distinguishable as a class from 'patent' or proprietary medicines. The effect on revenue of the revival of this exemption was negligible. In 1903 the revenue from the sale of medicine stamps was 333,371*l*. In 1904, the year following the test case, the revenue was 323,446*l*. As was shown by the large number of formulas registered in approved publications, the 'known, admitted, and approved' remedies sold by pharmacists and drug stores rapidly increased. But proprietary medicines were also growing numerically and trade was increasing as a result of the big national advertising campaigns now in full swing. The advertiser of those days was unfettered by any restraining influences, and he foisted upon a credulous public fantastic tales of wondrous discoveries and miraculous cures. This period may well be looked upon as the golden age of the proprietary medicine.

It was obvious that this state of affairs could not be allowed to continue indefinitely without inquiry, in view of rapid changes that were taking place in social services and welfare. The first indication of official anxiety towards the unrestricted sale of medicines was given in the appointment on April 25, 1912, of a Select Committee of the House of Commons to consider and inquire into the sale and the advertising of 'patent' and proprietary medicines. The Committee made the following recommendations for amending the Medicine Stamp Acts: That the Stamp Acts be consolidated and amended to remove the numerous existing anomalies and unreasonable exceptions. In this connection pure drugs vended entire under a fancy name should no longer be exempt from duty; the distinction between the name of an ailment and the name of an organ the seat of the ailment should be abandoned. (For example, headache tablets are dutiable; head tablets are not.) Further, any reference in advertising matter to the Government stamp should

be prohibited ; and no name of a proprietor or firm should be printed upon the stamp. How to carry out the Committee's suggestion to consolidate and amend the Acts was never determined, for the Great War had begun in August 1914, when the report was presented. But in 1915 medicine stamp duties were doubled, and this higher scale remains in force at the present time. In 1916 the revenue was sharply increased, being 627,454*l.*, compared with 333,777*l.* in 1915.

Since the War ended three attempts have been made to introduce legislation which would bring under control the entire trade. The first Bill appeared in 1920, the second in 1931, and the third in 1936. The 1920 Bill, which was introduced in the House of Lords, consisted of eleven clauses and a schedule of diseases not to be advertised. It reached its second reading. The introduction of a schedule with the names of twelve diseases or groups of diseases the advertising of relief or cure of which was to be prohibited was an innovation and more. It was a further indication of the feeling of uneasiness prevailing in official circles regarding the unrestricted recommendation of secret remedies for serious maladies. For, it must now be added, the people's health had been recognised as a matter for Government concern by the introduction of the National Health Insurance Act, 1912, which provided medical advice and medicine for persons earning less than 160*l.* a year. (The limit has since been raised to 250*l.*) The effect of this epoch-making social reform on the demand for 'patent' medicine was certainly not reflected in any decline in trade judged by the amount of revenue from the sale of 'patent' medicine stamps. In 1912 the total revenue was 327,857*l.*; in 1913, 328,319*l.*; in 1914, 360,377*l.* This rise in receipts foretold what was amply to be confirmed later—that in making the people health-conscious, National Health Insurance also created a demand for medicine greater than at any time in the history of the nation. There were, of course, other forces at work in the process. The practice of legitimate medicine, if it may be so described, was moving rapidly from empiricism, relict of the mediæval physicians, to modern methods of treatment based on the results of clinical research and scientific investigation. Medical discoveries were found to have

real news value and articles by medical correspondents kept the reading public, greedy for health topics, informed of the newer medicine. Another change in the lives of the people was the fact that they received a prescription from the panel doctor and not a bottle of medicine. For the separation of prescribing from dispensing was, thus far, now a reality in England, just as it had always been in Scotland. Illness was no longer to be endured. Health must be retained or recovered by the help of the panel doctor or by some medicine described in the newspaper—or by both!

The first curtailment in the unlimited field for the sale of medicines was made in 1917, when under the Venereal Disease Act, which came into force that year, it was made an offence to advertise a cure or offer to treat venereal disease. But the most important step towards limiting the use of powerful drugs was the passing of the Dangerous Drugs Act, 1920, and its successors, which made the use of opium, morphine, heroin, and cocaine in proprietary medicines difficult, undesirable, or indeed impossible. Many formulas of old established remedies were soon to be changed, either by omitting the potent drug altogether or reducing it below the legal limits. Meanwhile the proprietary medicine trade continued to prosper. In 1919, for the first time, the revenue from proprietary medicine stamps reached over 1,000,000*l*. The following are the actual figures from 1919 to 1930. In this last-mentioned year a change, to which reference will be made later in this article, in the official attitude towards 'known, admitted, and approved remedies' was announced. This altered viewpoint had important effects on the revenue as well as on the industry itself.

1919	1,065,693 <i>l</i> .	1925	1,323,317 <i>l</i> .
1920	1,322,661 <i>l</i> .	1926	1,290,007 <i>l</i> .
1921	1,369,730 <i>l</i> .	1927	1,215,139 <i>l</i> .
1922	1,328,448 <i>l</i> .	1928	1,249,445 <i>l</i> .
1923	1,219,703 <i>l</i> .	1929	1,333,512 <i>l</i> .
1924	1,306,776 <i>l</i> .	1930	1,234,199 <i>l</i> .

When the second attempt was made to promote proprietary medicine legislation in 1931, the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons, but made no progress. The Bill introduced in 1936 was described as the Medical and Surgical Appliances (Advertisements) Bill. It was

dropped on its coming up for the second reading, having failed to attract the necessary quorum. A significant omission from any of the three Bills was any reference to the question of the use of medicine stamps, despite the fact that revenue and proprietary medicines had been linked together since the first Act.

The ever-increasing number of applications for exemption of remedies from medicine stamp tax was causing a certain degree of concern to the Board of Customs and Excise. One reason was that it was becoming increasingly difficult to determine whether in law proprietary right had been claimed in a particular case. In 1930, therefore, came the important alteration in the attitude of the authorities to exempted remedies. The Commissioners decided that they could recognise these remedies only if the formula was disclosed on the label and a printed declaration made that no proprietary rights to the formula were claimed. For some time prior to this decision many manufacturers of proprietary medicines were in favour of discontinuing the stamping of medicines, to declare their formulas, and, as they were legally entitled to do, retain the huge sums formerly paid as revenue. The Board of Customs and Excise decision undoubtedly precipitated the process of what is termed 'destamping,' which has caused so serious a loss of revenue to the State and once again directed attention to the proprietary medicine industry. Revenue from the tax showed a continuous decline annually from 1931, when the returns stood at well over 1,000,000*l.*, to 1938, when the revenue was in round figures 750,000*l.*

The manufacturers who 'destamped' the medicines sold by chemists now issued the remedy in two different packs, since they still had to pay duty on all packs sold by licensed vendors. To the purchaser the price was the same whether he bought the medicine unstamped from the chemist as a 'known, admitted, and approved' remedy or from a licensed vendor as a 'patent' medicine. Thanks to the absurd but legal loophole the Government was losing several hundred thousand pounds annually which was not remitted to the purchasing public. The pharmacist and others (company chemists) were conceded a small percentage as a slight reward for the use of the qualification which was proving so valuable!

The laws relating to medicine stamp duty were now seen to be antiquated and effete. The trade itself, by its bold action, proclaimed the fact. The formula, hitherto the carefully guarded secret and the foundation of the medicine, was judged to be so unimportant that it could be divulged for everyone to copy. The value of the property had been transferred, by intensive advertising, to the trade mark or brand, and by advertising the goodwill of the remedy can be maintained. Although there are many well-known proprietary medicines the formulas of which are not divulged, the tendency, as matters stand, is for destamping to increase and the number of brands of the same formula, theoretically, to multiply. An actual example is seen in the alkaline powder introduced to medicine without reward by a well-known professor of medicine and commercialised to an astonishing degree by many firms throughout the country.

The time was now ripe for another attempt to solve the medicine stamp and proprietary medicine problem. Accordingly a second Select Committee on Medicine Stamp Duties was appointed on July 8, 1936, to consider the duties of excise chargeable with a view to reforming the law relating to them. It will be observed that on this occasion the problem was to be approached from the revenue angle. In the 1912 examination of the question public welfare was made the approach. But public welfare had become the subject of other legislation, as has been shown. Another law, the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1933, had been passed which placed further restrictions on the free use of potent drugs. It seemed, therefore, that the task which was one simply affecting revenue, or so it appeared to be, was one on which a satisfactory finality could be reached. The Committee held twelve open meetings and heard the evidence of thirty-five witnesses. Some indication of the ramifications of the proprietary medicine trade is seen in the number and nature of the bodies interested and represented: Board of Customs and Excise; Government Chemist; British Medical Association; Pharmaceutical Society of Great Britain; National Pharmaceutical Union; Proprietary Articles Trade Association; Wholesale Drug Trade Association; National Federation of

Grocers and Provision Dealers Association ; Association of Wholesale Druggists ; F. W. Woolworth & Co., Ltd. ; Ethical Pharmaceutical Association ; Manufacturers of Saline Preparations ; Co-operative Congress ; Company Chemists Association and Boots, Ltd. ; British Animal Medicine Makers Association ; National Farmers Union. This plethora of interests, however, can be simplified, for the purposes of this article, by considering the claims put forward by the bodies representing : (1) manufacturers, (2) pharmacists and company chemists, (3) other distributors. The manufacturers, as can be imagined, recommend the total abolition of the duties. It was held that the loss to the revenue in Medicine Stamp Tax would mean a greater yield of income tax and surtax. The retail chemists' spokesmen sought that the original exemption of 'known, admitted, and approved' remedies as applied to chemists and druggists should be continued and that the annual license fee for vendors be raised to 1*l*. The grocers submitted that there should be no distinction between classes of traders in regard to the sale of dutiable medicines. Messrs. F. W. Woolworth, Ltd., contended that special legislation had been passed safeguarding the public health and stated that, according to counsel's opinion, the exemption of certain articles from duty if sold by pharmacists or limited companies employing them was illegal and unconstitutional. These were the main points in the voluminous amount of evidence presented and heard. The committee in its report, which follows, took the view that the medicine stamp tax should in effect be a sales tax ; that the 'known, admitted, and approved' concession be abolished, that cosmetics be included, and that the scale of duties be revised (the bazaar stores could become additional points of distribution under the suggested scale).

The following are the recommendations in full :

'(1) That the Acts of 1802, 1804, 1812, Section 2 of the Finance Act, 1927, and all other existing legislation on the subject of Medicine Stamp Duties be repealed.

'(2) That, subject to the exemptions mentioned in (5) below : Preparation or substances of any sort, including medicines, medicaments, medicated articles, drugs, herbs, fumigants, inhalants, disinfectants, antiseptics, soaps, tooth pastes, tooth powders, mouth washes, medicated wines, natural



or artificial mineral waters or compositions for making such waters, confectionery, toilet preparations and cosmetics to be used or applied externally, internally or otherwise, as medicines or medicaments, which are recommended, held out, or advertised in any way whatsoever either directly or indirectly (whether by public display, wireless telephony, or other mechanical reproduction of the human voice or by label notice, circular, or other written recommendation or otherwise) for the prevention, cure, or relief of any human ailment, defect, disorder, condition, or habit or for the treatment of any part of the human body or for the protection or maintenance of bodily health should be liable to a duty based on the retail selling price.

'(3) That the present scale of duties should be revised as follows :

Retail Price excluding Duty.			Rate of Duty.
Exceeding.	Not exceeding.		
—	$\frac{1}{8}d.$	...	$\frac{1}{8}d.$
$\frac{1}{8}d.$	$1\frac{1}{8}d.$	...	$\frac{1}{4}d.$
$1\frac{1}{8}d.$	$3d.$	...	$\frac{1}{2}d.$
$3d.$	$6d.$	...	$1d.$
$6d.$	...	...	$1d.$ for the first $6d.$ and $1d.$ for every $6d.$ or part of $6d.$ over $6d.$ '

The present duties are as follows :

			<i>l.</i>	<i>s.</i>	<i>d.</i>
Price or value of 1s. or under	...	...	0	0	3
Exceeding 1s. and not 2s 6d.	...	...	0	0	6
"    4s. " " 10s.	...	...	0	2	0
"    10s. " " 20s.	...	...	0	4	0
"    20s. " " 30s.	...	...	0	6	0
"    30s. " " 50s.	...	...	1	0	0
"    50s. ... ..	...	...	2	0	0

'The Committee was inclined to recommend a direct *ad valorem* sales tax of a fixed percentage, but in view of some of the evidence, and especially that of the Customs and Excise, they were persuaded that this would be more difficult to administer and would cause more disturbance to existing prices and other arrangements of manufacturers. If, however, it were decided to adopt an *ad valorem* percentage duty the Committee recommended a rate of  $16\frac{2}{3}$  per cent., i.e.  $2d.$  in the  $1s.$

'(4) That the excise licence of 5s. per annum be continued as heretofore.

' (5) That exemption be granted to :

' (a) All medicines, etc. (as set out in paragraph 2 above) recommended and sold solely and exclusively to registered members of the medical or dental professions ;

' (b) all preparations, etc., supplied to registered medical or dental practitioners, for use in the discharge of their professional duties, also all preparations, etc., supplied to registered pharmacists or registered medical or dental practitioners for use in dispensing as a component part of medicines prescribed by such practitioners ;

' (c) all medicines, etc., exported for use or consumption abroad ; and

' (d) all British spa waters consumed only at the place of origin.'

The Committee also urged consideration of the propriety of taxing foods and certain appliances (such as deaf aids), beverages (alcoholic and otherwise), and other preparations widely advertised as possessing properties beneficial for health. If it was found difficult to distinguish between cosmetics which claim to be remedial and those which do not, the taxation of all cosmetics might receive consideration. Should control of the trade in medicines and appliances be deemed desirable for the protection of the public, the Committee believed that the best method of achieving this would be a system of examination and registration.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer by proposing to abolish the medicine stamp duties altogether made obvious the failure of the select committee to evolve a satisfactory scheme. His solution of the problem by total abolition has, at first, the semblance of a master stroke. Obviously, however, the far-reaching results which would follow were not fully appreciated. The loss of revenue to some extent could be regained in increased income tax and supertax. With 165,000 estimated points of distribution (chemists and licensed vendors) it can hardly be argued that further points are needed. The trade must therefore undergo a metamorphosis and a new business would be created for the 3*d.* and 6*d.* bazaar stores at the expense of the present distributors. Mr. Phillip Hill, the chairman of the largest proprietary medicine company in the country, said at a meeting that :

'An event of outstanding importance during the past year—probably the most important event which has ever happened in the history of proprietary medicine and proprietary article business—is the proposed repeal of medicine duties. It is, of course, too early for one to make any accurate forecast as to the extent of the benefit it will prove to our business; but one thing is already abundantly clear, and that is, that it opens up a vista of great possibilities. We have already been approached by some of the largest potential distributors in the country, who, in consequence of the conditions which previously existed, have in the past been prevented from dealing in our type of merchandise.'

The inference is obvious. It is, in fact, possible to go further and state that there would be nothing to prevent the bazaar stores from opening a drug department, and, with a registered pharmacist in charge, compete, with their present policy of restricted prices, as far as they wish to go, with the present sellers of drugs and medicines. This, once more, raises the interesting point as to what would happen to the present licensed vendors (to the number of 150,000) if the Medicine Stamp Acts were abolished. It has been held in the Court of Appeal that a business comprising the sale of drugs and medicines cannot be carried on, under the Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1933, unless the premises as well as the person in control are registered. A licensed vendor of proprietary medicines who has no qualification of any kind can do so in accordance with the law laid down in the Medicine Stamp Acts. The possibility of surprising happenings in the event of the total abolition of the Acts, therefore, is very real.

Everyone connected with the industry is agreed on the need for new and workable legislation for proprietary medicines. The feeling is gaining ground, and the safeguards provided by legislation are fostering the view, that there should be restriction rather than license in the buying facilities of drugs. The registered pharmacists, who, according to rival distributors, are prone to emphasise their importance as the protectors of the public, have a right to special consideration for two reasons. They are entitled to it by tradition and they have undergone special training and passed examinations to enable them to handle and sell drugs and poisons in accordance with

the requirements of the law. They should be granted their ancient privilege of selling 'known, admitted, and approved remedies' of their own manufacture as in the original concession. The licence fee for other vendors should be raised considerably. Manufacturers who pay the 5s. fee at present on behalf of distributors would continue to pay a higher rate if trade warranted the continuance. There seems to be no reason why in the circumstances the stamp duties should not be levelled down to bazaar prices, since it has for long been the practice of the drug trade in certain parts of the country to break bulk and sell pennyworths of proprietary remedies. But, as has been shown, all previous attempts at modifying the present system have failed and medicine stamp duty can no longer be considered apart from the much greater question—the general control of the distribution of medicines.

When all is said and done, therefore—and apart from the effects on legislation of the War against Hitlerism—it will be surprising if the present tangle can be straightened out before the 1940 Budget.

A. ST. CLAIR GEDDES.

## Art. 4.—RESTORATIONS.

'It was the Lord's doing, for such a restoration was never mentioned in any history, ancient or modern, since the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity ; nor so joyful a day and so bright ever seen in this nation, this happening when to expect or effect it was past all human policy.'

So wrote John Evelyn in his diary on May 29, 1660, and although more than one dynasty has regained its throne since those days, the restoration of Charles II remains the outstanding example of this type of political manifestation, while it has also proved the most enduring. It is true that the House of Stuart itself did not benefit long by this turn of the tide in favour of hereditary kingship, but in Great Britain the principle has ever since proved to be more important than the man or the family in whom or in which it might from time to time be embodied ; and since that day when Evelyn stood in the Strand 'and blessed God' there has been no serious attempt to question the principle itself.

It is not easy to say to what extent the restoration of Charles II was due to popular devotion to him and to his family, to affection for the old institutions for which they stood, and to a reaction against dictatorship and 'the rule of the Saints by the sword.' In the case of the great majority of Englishmen probably all three considerations were operative, though in varying degrees of intensity. In the church register of Maid's Moreton in Buckinghamshire the biographer of the restored monarch, Mr Arthur Bryant, has found an entry in the rector's hand which throws much light on the state of public feeling :

'This day, by the wonderful goodness of God, his Sacred Majesty King Charles II was peacefully restored to his martyred father's throne, the powerful armies of his enemies being amazed spectators and in some sort unwilling assistants to his return. . . . And from this day ancient orders began to be observed. *Laus Deo !*'

It was this desire to get back to the old normal mode of life again after a period of violent change that undoubtedly caused so many people to welcome the return of the Stuarts : hereditary kingship seemed to promise a security

and a continuity which had long been conspicuous by their absence. For this reason there is a section of opinion to-day which holds that history is about to repeat itself, and that in more than one country abroad the throne will ere long be re-established. Before, however, passing any judgment upon such a theory it is necessary to examine somewhat closely the lessons to be learnt from the restorations which have already taken place. In these circumstances those which best repay study are the classic instances of Charles II in England, of Louis XVIII in France, and of Alfonso XII in Spain, while in the post-war period the restoration of the present King of the Hellenes in 1935 merits careful examination. With this survey completed it will be possible to see how far, in the light of modern problems, there is any likelihood of a return of the kings when more settled conditions prevail throughout the world.

To understand why the Stuarts came back, it is necessary to realise what happened while they were away. Among the factors which restored Charles II to his father's throne were several, principally religious, that were peculiarly English, but there were others which have also been operative elsewhere. The monarchy had been abolished by a minority, and when, at the impeachment of Charles I, on hearing the phrase 'all the good people of England' Lady Fairfax cried out from the gallery, 'No, nor the hundredth part of them,' she did not greatly exaggerate. The Protectorate was the prototype of many a dictatorial régime of later times. It was a reaction against the chaos which had marked the period that immediately preceded it, and it represented an attempt to get back to all for which the old monarchy had stood on its material side, but without restoring the rightful monarch. It contained within itself the seeds of its own failure, and before long it was little more than the rule of a faction which kept one man in power by brute force. Cromwell realised this fact most clearly, and he did all he could to escape from so difficult a position. He toyed with the idea of re-establishing the kingship in his own person and he attempted to draw up a constitution that should broaden the basis of his rule, just as another dictator, Napoleon III, was to do two hundred years later. It was all in vain, and in his short lifetime as Lord



Protector there was a gulf between him and the mass of the English people which no constitutional compromise could bridge. In all fairness to Cromwell it must be admitted that he was under no illusions as to the weakness of his hold upon the supreme power, and he never desired to rule merely in the name of one section.

In consequence of its position the Protectorate was authoritarian. The Major-Generals—'Cromwell's mastiffs' as they were commonly called—carried matters with a far higher hand than has ever been the case in England before or since, and with overwhelming military force behind them they interfered in every department of the national life. It was a grim commentary on the alleged harshness of the personal rule of Charles I not so many years before. Slowly but surely a vague sense of fear spread over the country, and it was not easy to know who could be trusted. A word spoken in haste or the spite of a discharged servant might easily lead to a long spell of imprisonment, often combined with a crushing fine. It was little wonder that men prayed for 'a speedy deliverance out of the power of the Major-Generals, and restore us to the protection of the Common Law.' If Cromwell was preferable to the sectaries, his rule soon came to be regretted on account of its harshness, and men welcomed the return of the Stuarts as restoring a happy mean between autocracy and licence.

This feeling was accentuated by the economic crisis produced by the foreign policy of the Protectorate, and the resulting distress was so widespread that discontent was rife even in those counties which had supported the Parliamentary cause in the late wars. As early as 1656, we are told, the merchants whose business was mainly with Spain and the Spanish Netherlands were already intriguing with the Stuarts, and modern research leaves little cause to doubt that Charles II owed his return to the throne at least as much to resentment against the mistakes of the preceding régime in the field of economics as to its religious and political programme. The victory of the Dunes, for example, did nothing to reconcile Bristol to the loss of 250 ships captured by Spanish privateers. Oliver Cromwell was neither the first nor the last dictator to discover that in the long run military glory does not atone for bad economics.

Attempts have been made, though by politicians rather than by historians, to trace a parallel between the restoration of Charles II and that of Louis XVIII. The latter was nearly sixty years of age when he first ascended the throne of France, whereas Charles was but thirty-three when he was restored. Louis was shrewd and witty, the usurper whom he succeeded was the greatest soldier of his age, and he had a brother who undid all his good work ; but there the resemblance between the English and French restorations ends. Not only had the exile been far longer in the one case than in the other, but the changes which had occurred in the absence of the legitimate sovereign had been infinitely more far-reaching, for they had been social as well as political and religious. Moreover, although it is untrue to say that the Bourbons were restored by foreign bayonets, they returned in the wake of foreign armies on the morrow of a great national disaster. The England of Charles II bore more than a superficial likeness to that of Charles I, but the France of Louis XVIII was a very different land from that over which his elder brother had reigned. The founders of the July Monarchy, notably Thiers and Guizot, and many a foreign observer thought that there was a parallel between the two revolutions and restorations, and therefore attempted to establish the throne of Louis Philippe upon what proved to be the shifting sands of a false analogy. The English revolution was a purely domestic, while the French was a world-wide, event, and the two have little or nothing in common.

At the same time the Jacobites were never so close to success, not even when Prince Charles Edward was at Derby, as was the Comte de Chambord. On one occasion the carriages in which he was to make his entry into Paris had actually been built, the horses that were to draw them had been bought, and the uniforms of the Court had been made, while a monarchical constitution was in proof, and there was a majority in the National Assembly waiting to pass it the moment the word arrived that the Comte de Chambord had accepted the throne. But Henry V, in spite of his many admirable qualities and of views on social questions far ahead of his time, lacked, as one of his most devoted followers put it, '*l'ambition et la hardiesse, conditions essentielles à un prétendant.*' He allowed

the relatively unimportant question of the flag to assume such proportions that it ultimately came between him and his goal, and so he missed what was to prove the last chance of regaining the crown. This insistence on trifles proved, no doubt, how good a Frenchman he was at heart, but it constitutes a warning to other princes in similar circumstances.

The Spanish restoration of 1874-75 much more closely resembled its English than its French counterpart. The period when kingship was in abeyance proved disastrous economically for both countries concerned, while in Spain the national prestige had also greatly declined. The restored monarchs were young men, and the world is always optimistic in respect of youthful princes. In both cases the exiled dynasty owed its return to the action of a general, in neither had the revolution been social in its nature, and if Charles II could command the services of a Hyde, Alfonso XII had a Cánovas at his side. The returned Bourbons, however, suffered from the disadvantage that, unlike the Stuarts, they were unable to dispense with the services of the army which had enabled them to regain the throne, and military interference by no means ceased with the *pronunciamiento* of Martinez Campos. There was also the added handicap that, as in France, the royal family was for so long divided against itself, and thus the throne was deprived of the support of those who should have been its protagonists. Indeed, in retrospect it is impossible not to regret that Don Carlos did not succeed his brother, Ferdinand VII. Had this happened the monarchists would not have been split and Spain would have been spared three civil wars as well as two singularly unsuccessful experiments in republicanism. Furthermore, she lost, in the Carlist claimants, the services of monarchs of considerable ability and high character, while she would have avoided two long and disastrous minorities and, in all probability, much military licence.

In this connection, and in view of possible developments in the Peninsula, it is important to note that the feud between the two branches of the Spanish royal house is now at an end, but some account of it must be given if the present divisions between General Franco's supporters are to be understood. The schism lasted for

over a hundred years, for it began in the last years of the reign of Ferdinand VII. That monarch, although he had been married three times, was childless, and his heir was, as mentioned above, his brother, Don Carlos. In 1830, however, the king entered into matrimony once more, on this occasion with Maria Cristina of Naples, and in due course it was announced that the Queen was pregnant. This event at once raised a constitutional problem of the first importance, and to appreciate the political and personal passions which for so long divided the Spanish royalists it must first of all be remembered that the principle of the succession to the throne had not been settled; indeed, it was very much open to question. The *Siete Partidas* of Alfonso X had recognised the right of females to succeed to the throne of Castille and Leon in default of male heirs of an equally near degree of consanguinity, and that this right had also been admitted in practice is proved by the succession of Isabella I; it was recognised, too, in Aragon, for the claim of Charles I was through his mother, Juana the Mad. With the advent of the Bourbons a change was made, and in 1713 Philip V introduced the Salic Law, which established the French procedure.

The matter was still further complicated by the fact that, for some obscure reason, Charles IV in 1789 convoked the Cortes in secret session, and on his initiative a resolution was passed asking him to revert to the old order of succession, but the necessary decree had never been promulgated. In March 1830 Ferdinand VII promulgated the Pragmatic Sanction of Charles IV, and in June of the same year he made a will in which he left the crown to his unborn child. Don Carlos could not and did not object to the principle of leaving the crown by will, for it was owing to an act of this nature on the part of Charles II that the Bourbons were in the Peninsula at all, but he protested against the promulgation of the Pragmatic Sanction. He denied that it was genuine and declared that, in any case, since he was alive at the date of its enactment, it could not be retrospective. Ferdinand at one time gave way and revoked the Pragmatic Sanction, but he eventually destroyed the revocation, and when a daughter, Isabella, was born, he recognised her as his heir. In this way the Carlists, who were traditional in all else,

were thus supporters of an alien innovation, namely the Salic Law.

When the Second Republic came into existence in 1931 the Carlist heir was Don Jaime de Borbón, but he died shortly afterwards, and his claims passed to his uncle, Don Alfonso de Borbón y Este. Five years later he too died, and with him the descendants of the first Don Carlos became extinct in the male line. If the Salic Law is held to apply then it is to the heirs of the younger brother of Don Carlos, Don Francisco de Paula, that the Spaniards should look for their monarch; but his elder son married Isabella II, so that on every score the rightful King is Don Alfonso XIII. That the Spanish monarchists are at last united is of the utmost importance, especially in view of the division in the victorious forces of General Franco on the question of the régime.

When one turns to the restoration of the Greek monarchy three and a half years ago it is to consider a movement which reflects the highest credit upon all concerned. The king and his advisers were thoroughly familiar with the lessons of previous restorations and knew quite well the mistakes to avoid, while the Greeks are above all else a practical people; consequently the restoration was effected with the minimum of disturbance. In view of the predominant part played by General Condylis, who had declared only two years before that if any attempt were made to restore the monarchy he would take to the hills to defend the republic, King George determined that if he was to be spared that military domination to which Alfonso XII had been subjected he must make it clear that he, not Condylis, was master. Hardly had the monarch set foot once more on Greek soil than the clash came. Earlier in the year there had been a Venizelist rising, and the king now demanded an amnesty for all who had been implicated, including Venizelos himself. Condylis refused to agree, and so, within a few days of the restoration, the king was compelled to dismiss the man to whom he appeared to owe his crown. On this account he naturally acquired a good deal of odium in ultra-royalist circles, but this was entirely undeserved. Condylis only declared himself a monarchist when he saw that public opinion was coming to favour a restoration, and he was determined that the monarch should be a

puppet with himself as dictator. From the beginning he had played for his own hand, and King George owed him nothing. It must, however, be said in his favour that he took his dismissal with none too bad a grace, but as he died shortly afterwards it is impossible to say how long he would have continued to refrain from making trouble.

In this way King George avoided the difficulties which other restored monarchs had encountered. He became the creature neither of an ambitious general nor of a faction anxious only to use him as a weapon against their political opponents. Moreover, he is himself a realist, with the highest sense of his duty to the Greek people, and he did not, like the Comte de Chambord, allow trifles to stand in the way of the fulfilment of that duty. The consequence has been that he has achieved the almost unique distinction of being restored to the throne of which he had been dispossessed, for it is indeed rare for a dynasty to be restored in the person of the dethroned monarch himself. The Greeks, on their part, showed a readiness to abandon the old monarchist and republican labels that did them credit, for their vivid sense of reality had convinced them that the chaos which marked the eleven years of republican rule could only be brought to an end by a change of régime. So it has come about that the latest restoration may well be regarded as a model of its kind.

After this brief consideration of the more important restorations of modern times it is possible to examine, in the light of what happened during the course of them, the chances of further restorations in the future. Not so many years ago hereditary kingship seemed an outworn institution and government 'of the people, by the people, for the people' was the order of the day. Now the pendulum of public favour has swung as far in the direction of autocracy as once it did in that of democracy, while the few countries which are still free are for the most part monarchies in the popular, not the etymological, sense of the word. One thing at any rate is clear, and it is that in a world which has perforce lost the capacity for surprise no development can be ruled out as impossible.

Human nature craves for pageantry in its public life. Germany of the Weimar Constitution, for example, was a



drab place to those who had been brought up amid the splendour, however superficial, of the Hohenzollern Empire, and thus the showy pomp of the Nazis made an irresistible appeal. Herr Hitler has shown himself shrewd enough in this respect, and demonstration follows demonstration in the attempt to win to his side the German love of display. Elsewhere it is the same story. The modern world has been so mechanised that its inhabitants are clutching at every chance which presents itself to escape from its monotony, and he is a wise ruler who surrounds his power with a certain amount of pomp and circumstance. It was the same in the Middle Ages, when the sordidness of everyday existence was relieved by the festivals of the Church and by the knightly tournaments. It may be regrettable, but it is certainly indisputable, that a régime which appeals to the head alone is nothing like so strong as one which appeals both to head and to heart.

In kingship this craving has always found special satisfaction. Mr Christopher Dawson exactly analysed the situation when he wrote :

'The fact remains that the typical leaders of bourgeois society do not arouse the same respect as that which is felt for the corresponding figures in the old régime. We instinctively feel that there is something honourable about a king, a noble, or a knight which the banker, the stockbroker, or the democratic politician does not possess. A king may be a bad king, but our very condemnation of him is a tribute to the prestige of his office.'

This is undeniably true, but of recent years the reaction against the bourgeois conception of society has carried nations to dictators, not kings, and the question is whether this tendency is even yet at an end. A few years ago there was a real danger that owing to the lack both of political skill and of unity on the part of royalists in the different countries dictatorship might for all time take the place of kingship in the popular imagination. To-day that danger is not so great, though it still exists, for it is becoming apparent that pure dictatorship is possessed of most of the vices of democracy without any of its virtues. Stability it may ensure, though apparently only for a brief period, but continuity is beyond its power to guarantee, and in the hard school of experience men

are once more coming to realise that continuity is of far greater value to a nation than they at one time thought.

It would appear as if Spain, so often the battlefield of opposing political and religious systems, may well be the scene of a conflict between the supporters of kingship and those of dictatorship. The part played by the Carlist *requetes* in the Nationalist victory was very considerable, and to them must be added the large number of followers of Don Alfonso XIII. When General Franco struck his first blow three years ago it was taken for granted that his success would mean the restoration of the Bourbons, and it is under the old monarchist flag that his armies have fought. As the war continued, however, the Spanish Phalanx, a Fascist organisation which had been of no great importance before the outbreak of hostilities, came to the fore, and it of course received the full support of Berlin and Rome. In this connection it must not be forgotten that everywhere, save in Italy itself, Fascism is anti-monarchical, while National Socialism is the sworn enemy of kings. General Franco endeavoured to prevent an open breach by uniting the *requetes* and the *falangistas* in one organisation, and he succeeded for so long as the war lasted. Now, however, there are ominous signs that a split on the subject of the restoration cannot be avoided much longer.

The *falangistas* look for inspiration to the memory of General Primo de Rivera, a very great gentleman and one under whose rule Spain made more progress than for several generations. They consider that he was badly treated by King Alfonso, and that if the latter had co-operated more loyally with him many of their country's subsequent troubles would have been avoided. They also fear that a restoration of the Bourbons would mean the return to power of the old politicians who were responsible for the catastrophe of 1931. The Phalanx is recruited from the same class of young men as fill the Nazi and Fascist ranks, and it is said, though with what degree of accuracy is not easy to determine, that a good many have come from the parties of the Left. The Italian and German Governments support the *falangistas* for a variety of reasons, of which one of the most important is the fear that the return of King Alfonso or the Prince of Asturias to the throne would mean the closer association of Spain

with Great Britain and France in the international field. They cannot forget the attitude of the Spanish royal family in the last war, and an indiscreet reference not long ago in a public speech by a British general to the advantages to Great Britain of a Bourbon restoration did not tend to advance the cause which the speaker had at heart. One can hardly imagine our ancestors taking any more readily to Charles II because of a statement by Condé or Turenne that his return to the throne would serve vital French interests.

The royalists, on the other hand, whether of Alfonsist or Carlist origin, feel that the Nationalist victory will be incomplete without a restoration, and they point to the chaos which has in Spain always marked the absence of royalty. It will be interesting to see what attitude the Church will adopt. General Primo de Rivera favoured the regular clergy at the expense of the secular, with the result that large numbers of the latter voted republican in 1931—a mistake for which many of them later paid with their lives. King Alfonso was also at one time none too popular with the late Pope on account of a speech he made at the Vatican. Against this must be set the fact that purely dictatorial régimes have not shown much regard for the Church, and Pope Pius XII is not reputed to look on them with any particular favour. The Spaniard is a mixture of realist and traditionalist, and the monarchists seem to be more in harmony with the national tradition than are the Fascists. These last are also tainted with a foreign ideology, and if there is one point upon which the new Spain has no doubts it is that she is not going to look abroad for the solution of her problems. There has been too much of that during the past two hundred years, and this time she is going to her own glorious past for inspiration. This favours a restoration.

Whatever may be General Franco's intentions in this matter—there is no doubt about his own personal sympathies—he could not take any action until the civil war had been completely liquidated. It would have been in the last degree undesirable that Spaniards should shoot Spaniards in the name of the King of Spain, and a monarch must, like King George II of the Hellenes, where possible return with an amnesty. Above all, he must not, like Louis XVIII, even appear to owe his return

to foreign support. For all these reasons, and quite apart from differences of opinion among his own followers, General Franco was very wise to hold his hand.

In these latter years Spain and Portugal have come very close together, and events in the one country have a great influence on those in the other. If, therefore, the Spanish monarchy is restored it is more than likely that there will be a king in Lisbon once again. Senhor Salazar has conferred greater benefits upon his country than any Portuguese for centuries, but if his work is to survive him he must surely set up the throne. That he is not opposed to kingship in principle is clear from the respect which he has publicly paid to the memory of King Carlos and King Manuel II, and the reburial of the latter in his native soil was an eloquent tribute to the strength of the monarchist tradition in Portugal. King Manuel was the last of his, the junior, branch of the House of Braganza, and the heir is Dom Duarte, a young man in his early thirties. Well read, active, and with a charming personality, he holds views on political and economic problems which approximate very closely to those of Senhor Salazar, and his restoration would ensure that continuity which otherwise may, if the record of Portugal during the past century is any guide, be broken. The problem of the régime is, it may be added, a purely domestic question, and a change would not involve any foreign complications. The days are gone when kings looked to Central Europe for guidance, and the restoration of Dom Duarte would be more likely to strengthen than to weaken the alliance with Great Britain, which is the cornerstone of Portuguese foreign policy. Nevertheless, the fate of the House of Braganza is likely to turn on what happens in Madrid.

There are many royalists, secret or avowed, in other countries which are subject to republican or dictatorial governments, and in more than one there has within the last few years been every chance of the restoration of the exiled dynasty. Germany is a notable case in point. When National Socialism first began to make rapid progress ten years ago Dr Brüning came to the conclusion that only the restoration of the Hohenzollerns could prevent Hitler from ultimately attaining supreme power. His plan was first of all to secure the re-election of

Hindenburg as President, so as to inflict a severe reverse on the Nazis, and then to obtain a two-thirds majority in the Reichstag and the Reichsrat to make him regent for life, at the end of which time the eldest son of the Crown Prince was to succeed to the throne. The restored monarchy was not, however, to be that of 1871 or even that of which Prince Max of Baden was thinking in 1918: it was to be a constitutional monarchy on the British model, based on the consent of the people and operating through a system of checks and balances. For such a scheme the Chancellor obtained the necessary support even from the Socialists, and he hoped by this means to deprive Hitler of the conservative element among his supporters, that is to say, officers of the Imperial army, East Prussian landlords, former government officials, and the like. To Brüning's surprise Hindenburg would not listen to the proposal. 'I am the trustee of the Emperor,' he declared, 'and can never give my consent to anyone succeeding to the throne save the Emperor himself.' In vain the Chancellor tried to persuade him. 'Though I spoke with the tongues of men and of angels,' Brüning said later, 'I could have made no impression on him.' Whether Hindenburg's attitude was due to the machinations of the Nazis or to the obstinacy of an old man secretly convinced that he had betrayed his trust on that November day at Spa will probably never now be known.

The future of the Hohenzollerns and of the other dethroned German dynasties may to-day appear to have little practical interest, but who in the heyday of Napoleon's power would have foretold the restoration of Louis XVIII? Hitler, like the French Emperor, is at great pains to impress upon both his own country and the outside world that the régime of which he is the head alone stands between his fellow-countrymen and revolutionary chaos, but it is extremely doubtful whether this is the case. In the event of a collapse of the existing order, either as the result of defeat in war or of pressure from within, it is far more likely that some such settlement as that envisaged by Brüning would be reached. As in France after the fall of the Second Empire, there is almost certain to be a reaction against the excessive centralisation of the Third Reich, and this may well take the form of a

federal union in which some of the states will regain their autonomy. If this happens, and it is far more probable than Red revolution, the local dynasties may easily regain their thrones.

The same observation applies to the Habsburgs in Austria. It would be difficult in the course of recorded history to find such a series of missed chances as that of which the Archduke Otto has been the victim, and recent revelations would seem to show that much of the blame must attach to Dr Schuschnigg. The Archduke himself has been the subject of so many vicissitudes that even the incorporation of his country in the German Reich has failed to shake his hope of the future, and it may well be that he is justified in his optimism. Just as a flood obliterates all the familiar features in a landscape, so has the Nazi tide changed the aspect of Central Europe ; but when the waters recede the buildings, trees, and hedges once more appear, and this may be the case with the old institutions of those countries now submerged under the rule of Hitler. It was so after the domination of the Turks and after that of Napoleon, and what has happened before may happen again : the only difference is that events move more rapidly in these days.

There are those who believe that one day there will be a king again in France, but in spite of the ability and energy of the Comte de Paris, the son of the Duc de Guise, it is difficult to share this belief. There are large numbers of Frenchmen who would vaguely prefer a king to a president, but they are in no way prepared to face the disturbance which such a change might entail. Fifteen years ago royalist hopes had more justification, but the monarchists preferred writing and talking to action. The *Action Française*, too, has done more harm than good, especially since its condemnation by the Church, and it is now on the worst of terms with the Duc de Guise himself ; indeed, when the Comte de Paris paid his daring surprise visit to France a few months ago the *Action Française* was one of the few papers which was not asked to send a representative to meet him. The Comte de Paris is a young man of very progressive views, who, were he restored to the throne, would assuredly not bring back the *ancien régime* as this is conceived by the average Frenchman. He stands



for a corporative monarchy, and social reform on an extended scale. By means of a weekly paper, which he edits himself, he makes his views known, and though he is constrained to live in exile in Belgium, his wife, a Brazilian princess by birth, makes frequent visits to Paris. In spite of all this, he is continually being attacked by those who agree with most of his views and who ought to be working their hardest to place the crown on his head. In effect, he has to devote most of his energy to removing the impression that he is a debauched degenerate whose return to France would be marked by the restoration of aristocratic privileges and by the supremacy of the Church over the State.

That the Comte de Paris will be able to overcome the prejudice against him is not easy to believe, though if ever there is a change of régime in France it is far more likely to be in favour of a king than of a dictator. In existing circumstances this could probably only be brought about by fear of Communism or by a general breakdown of the machinery of government, which would, as on previous occasions, cause the *bourgeoisie* to accept the leadership of whoever first came forward as the saviour of society: this might well prove to be the Comte de Paris, but, even so, he would require the support of others than the eminent men of letters upon whom he is at present so largely forced to depend.

Whether there will be a return to hereditary kingship in France as elsewhere depends, then, upon the course of events. The strength of the system lies in the fact that it can exist with almost any form of government, while a dictator must dictate or go. Changing circumstances require different attitudes on the part of the executive. In periods of crisis a strong executive is essential, but at other times it may be advisable to give considerable freedom to the legislative. Kingship can play its part on either occasion, but dictatorship cannot. Whether and if so when this fact will come to be appreciated by the world at large is another matter.

CHARLES PETRIE.

Art. 5.—AMERICA AND ISOLATION.

THE 'little American,' the small business man, the farmer of the West—the West meaning anywhere to the west of the Mississippi—all those people who a few years ago were concentrating on their own businesses and surroundings, to-day have the world's news brought to them. They are hearing of the world. They are no longer ignorant. This means not only that the traditional British view of the Middle West is inaccurate, but that the Middle West of tradition no longer exists.

Instead, modern America gives an impression of unity, and it is well to point out here that in this article, for convenience sake and without any want of respect to Canada, by 'America' generally the United States are meant. They comprise a group of states which is rapidly becoming a united and self-conscious great nation. This is largely due to three forces: the radio; increased facilities for travel—particularly by car; and an improved national press, which draws its news from more or less common sources. And those forces which are drawing together the different parts of America are clearly influences that educate and instruct average public opinion as well. Indeed, opinion on general matters which concern the country as a whole is rapidly becoming 'American.' And it is only when we have recognised this new condition that we can begin to think of what Americans are likely to do to fulfil the rôle which their place in the world allots to them. But even before attempting to predict what American public opinion would have the United States do or not do, one fundamental question must be answered: the question put by the isolationists. Is America, after all, bound to be concerned with what goes on in the rest of the world? The answer, I believe, is several times, Yes. But to answer it fully we must go back to the roots of America's history and of her present economic position.

If you journey among the flat farms of western Kansas; through the dry, rolling country that used to be prairie on the banks of the Missouri river; down further south among the lovely hills of Arkansas or the fantastic plains of Texas; or north to the rocks and lakes of Minnesota and the dry belt of Montana and the Dakotas—

indeed, through any of those vast regions in the heart of North America, and think for a moment of war, of the aspirations, say, of some thousands of Germans who may have been included by mistake within the boundaries of Poland, or of other thousands of Hungarians now forced to call themselves Rumanians, the whole question of European peace seems infinitely distant. Here there are millions of human beings struggling with their own problems, making or losing money, rich, poor, and—a few of them—destitute. They are tilling the land, making roads, teaching, buying and selling, being lawyers and doctors : and so constitute a people fully occupied every day of its life with the problems of its own existence. For thirteen hundred miles—or more than three times the distance from London to Edinburgh—both to the west and to the east of them there are nothing but other people similar to themselves, under the same government in the same land, and beyond that far coastline there is, on the one side 3,000, on the other 6,000 miles of ocean before another country is reached. These people in the middle of a continent are part of a modern nation of 130 millions who possess the greatest industrial and natural resources in the world. They are physically so far from anyone who might want to bomb them that an air-raid is almost out of the question.

The first and most important answer to the isolationist argument is to be found in the history of the institutions, customs, and form of government of the United States, which started by being a series of small colonies inhabited mainly by men of English or Dutch descent. And to-day, though the great republic in North America is neither English nor Dutch, she has adopted what in her young days she thought was best of the British, Dutch, and revolutionary French idealism. Though she threw off the political shackles of Europe, for the reason that she was weak and not sure of herself, she remained in touch with the ideals of those countries from which she had drawn her origins. The outlook of her people, when they considered the relations of man to the State, to his fellow citizens, and to the way of life he would have to lead, was much the same as that of progressive nineteenth-century Englishmen and Frenchmen. So it was that America's attitude to the problem of living grew

democratic, mainly Anglo-Saxon, liberal in the full sense, and 'Western' as opposed to Oriental.

But American idealism was not identical with that of any country in the Old World. The fundamental addition which it made to what was already established we may call the 'American Dream,' the principle that every man is as good as his neighbour. This did not necessarily mean political and social equality, for men are not born equal; but it meant a crude hope that every man who set foot on the western shores of the Atlantic would have rights which would be respected. But though the American Dream embodied something new which the Old World had not known, its development at no time took America out of that circle of democratic nations to which through her origins she belonged. The truth was, indeed, the reverse. There are three outcomes of this ideological link, never broken, which bound and still binds America to Anglo-Saxon and democratic ideals and makes her a part of the world. The first is that she has a body of peoples in herself in whom her tradition and its origins are not naturally reflected. The millions who became American citizens between the turn of the century and the Great War, and immediately after the War, were not only of a different psychological stamp from those who had preceded them and framed the skeleton of America, but they arrived in such a rush together that they threatened to engulf the country to which they came.

Yet the States set about digesting them so well and so thoroughly that their presence, while it remained a problem, was never a catastrophe, though it came near to bringing disaster to the direct development of American traditions and idealism, with the result that there are two Americas to-day. One is the descendant of the old America founded on those ideals of the past which thirteen little colonies once knew were great enough to justify their revolting from a mother country. The other is a new, somewhat ungainly, often hideous America, a mixture of the old and the new. It is the product of Latin and German races assimilated into an ideal that is primarily Anglo-Saxon. But it is the part of America which has built skyscrapers and made America great in a new way. It has achieved something which the old

type of settlers would never have achieved if left to themselves—nor would they have suffered under its disadvantages. An example of this is to be found in the difference between the Deep South and western Pennsylvania; between the older parts of New England and the mammoth buildings of Chicago. The second outcome of America's Anglo-Saxon connection and tradition is apparent even to-day. Both the new America as well as the old have a respect more or less general and more or less tacit for things British. There are many Rolls-Royces in New York and much old English furniture in Southern homes. This respect is not always evident, but that it is there, even if not always admitted, is significant.

So we come to the third modern result of the past: a combination of the last two in a practical form which concerns the world as well as North America. It is that the States have developed themselves in such a way as to come to a position wherein they may lose should the Teutonic ideal capture the rest of the earth. Fascism was not started in Germany and, indeed, Nazi Germany is not technically Fascist at all. Nevertheless, in terms of authoritarian and democratic idealism, Fascism is the modern form of the traditional German philosophy. That is one reason why Herr Hitler has been able to make headway in Germany; he has been preaching along lines which Frederick the Great and William II, each in his own way, had pursued before him. This was the way of the Teutonic philosophers, who represent the antithesis to the English-French school, which was responsible for spreading the doctrines of Liberalism over nineteenth-century Europe—and America.

One of the best proofs that modern Americanism is something tremendously vital is shown in its power to assimilate alien peoples. The greatest provocation that America has had to alter her ideologies in such a way as to induce her to abandon the Liberal fold has been the influx of Teutonic peoples which has occurred on several occasions in her history. To-day Milwaukee and St. Louis are in large parts purely German, while many other cities, including Chicago and New York, have a high proportion of German inhabitants. But for the most part these people have been assimilated and in the process

have helped to form the new America. They are becoming real Americans. 1917 and 1918 found some of them face to face with their own relatives in the trenches—than which no greater tribute could be paid them.

They were never, of course, true bearers of the Teutonic outlook, for most of them came to America because they were out of sympathy with the regime at home—this happened in 1848 and again at the end of the century; just as would happen once more to-day if America had not closed her gates. So they were glad, these immigrants, to assume the mantle of the Pilgrim Fathers. Nevertheless they were Germans. They came from a country and stock with which American ideals were not naturally in sympathy. And in that there was a nation and philosophy in Europe, such as belonged to their Fatherland, with which America could not fundamentally agree, lies the proof that she must and does care what happens in the rest of the civilised world. She is linked by race and ideology with one set of peoples, and has unconsciously based her standards, political and moral, on the exclusion of another set from world hegemony.

When, in 1917, America went to war on the side of the Allies, there were deeper causes and more fundamental movements at work than the issue of the freedom of the seas. Without a certain attitude of mind the American people would never have fought to 'make the world safe for democracy.' President Wilson could never have moved the country merely because he and his advisers had become exasperated with German piracy on the seas. America was moved to fight because she was finding all the tenets of her idealism threatened and abused. What to-day is appearing to Americans as the dictatorship menace to European Democracy was apparent then as the attempt of royal autocracy to dictate to Europe and so ultimately the world. America hesitated over the prospect of joining in, but finally identified herself with the only side for which she could ever have sincerely willed to fight. Proof was thus given in blood, if it were ever needed, that she has it in herself to crusade for what she believes in.

She has in her history fought a civil war and a huge national war for an ideal. It is not unreasonable to suppose that what she has twice defended with her blood she will



think about fighting for again. Indeed, her position may be compared on the grand scale—since it concerns her whole way of life, what she lives for and what she is—with Britain's position before 1914. Sir Edward Grey never made such a declaration of policy then as those which the British Government has made in recent years, starting with that of Mr. Eden in November of 1936; and it is reasonable to take the view that in 1914 Germany could not tell what Britain would do in the event of war between France and herself. Yet all the while Britain stood, in truth, virtually committed. When the time came no one doubted seriously that she had found her destiny when Poilu and Tommy were in the trenches side by side. Looking at America to-day in this light a path of possible destiny is visible. Nothing can force her to take it—but it is a path wide open before her. Least of all can she deny that it exists. She would stand to lose in a Teutonic world. She believes in things by which certain people in Europe are proud to set no store; and is concerned in the truth that an ideological clash in Europe might lead to the defeat of the idealism on which she was founded. This is the first and deepest reason why she is a part of our world.

But there are others. In spite of her similarities with us, America, when all is said and done, is not out of a mould identical with ourselves. In developing her institutions and particular form of civilised thought, she has, it seems, taken a turning off the avenue which we had laid out before her. She has found a philosophy and outlook of her own. She has invented the American Dream. She has become the real New World. She has given her sons the hope that their individual rights will for ever be respected, and more insistently than ever has raised the question, 'Will this draw them out of the world or keep them in it?' No one has ever expressed all that is or was meant by the Dream—which is beyond words. For the Dream is to be found only in the deeds of American history—in the deadly, earnest tramping across a prairie, in work accomplished at the outposts of civilisation, in misery suffered and borne through the poverties of a northern winter. It is to be seen in the heroism and gallantry demanded and shown by a people who struggled across a continent, because they were sure

that what they left behind them was not good, not so good as that which they were promised. It lives in the history of a little town on the Atlantic coast or of a grim flat city built among the roots of wandering blue-grass. It is there even among the stately pillars and cool halls of a house on a Southern cotton plantation. Its spur is the harshness of a strong climate and its sign the sunrise of a morning among the mountains in the West.

The Dream lived to be unfulfilled. If it had been fulfilled it would have died. It was based on the life of a new country where a fresh start was being made. And if the hope had died, the foundation of that beginning would have been taken away. Nor could there be fulfilment of a Dream which believed that America should never know any country but her own, and should cut herself away from the roots from which she had drawn her first life. For the Dream held that America should be the shining future of an old, decayed world. And for this to be possible some background of decay, of comparative lack-lustre, was essential. Thus it was that even here, in what America created for herself, is and was to be found inherent a link with the outside world—which is the second good reason why America is a part of our world.

The old Dream has faded. You will find it hard to see in the busy clatter of modern industrialism. Some would say it is lost. Michael Foster seems to feel that truth, in a magnificent passage in his novel 'American Dream,' wherein he describes the reflections of a young man, leaning over the rail of a small cargo boat ploughing southward in the Caribbean sea :

'S—— was thinking of days that had gone from these seas ; and somehow, with them, he thought, a dream and a promise had been lost. Above these horizons had lifted the topsails of Spanish gentlemen navigating for the islands of a New World which really would be new. Across these waters had passed the ships from little ports of Devon, bound for the Virginia capes, outposts of a continent where man would have a new home. Here had sailed the buccaneers, on the seas of an Homeric morning ; and here had passed little ships flying an orphan ensign of thirteen stars, and the rolling thunder of their guns giving an old world a new law—the freedom of the seas. And through these

latitudes had boomed the China clippers, and their flags had more stars; and the California clippers, slamming down to the Horn with a roar of shaken canvas—and their flags had the stars of a new nation which had found wealth in distant mountains of the sun. And now—a cargo tramp was dirtying the stars with the smoke of commerce. And a dream was lost.'

But is it lost? All that was in it is a part of America to-day. Although changed a little and hard to find, it is there, or if the old Dream has faded, a new one has risen in its place. For the American Dream is still alive in the small town that has not yet come to live like the big city. If you look there—and still further from the big city—you will find the remains of the spirit that bred America. The big city by itself spells commercialism; and commercialism on the scale of modern industry kills that urge to great purposes which flourished among a simpler people who lived by the land and worked each for himself.

If you go to-day and meet the farmer of Nebraska, the woodsman of Tennessee, the cross-roads storekeeper of Arkansas, the Colorado mountaineer, the ranger of Arizona and the desert lands, the miner in Montana and Idaho—countless millions like them, straight, good-hearted, genuine Americans—you will find that the old America is still alive unsullied by the new. Few of these people can express their beliefs and ideals to you. They are not articulate in matters of that kind. Nor are they greatly intelligent. But taken as a whole they represent the antithesis to the modern commercial big city. For they are the men who have inherited the past. They believe in democracy, free speech and liberty, justice and truth. These things to them are positive. And they represent millions of voters without whom no President could go to war or remain at peace. In spite of their everyday isolationism, they represent America's greatest link with a like-minded world. Their influence might, it is true, be directed into channels that they would not approve in cold reason. For they are emotional. They derive this from the temperament of their country. It is violent and extreme. They might, as they have in the past, be led into opposing any kind of war. They were so led from 1914 to 1917, and they could be so led again. In

1915 they accused men who thought America should fight of being spies—and ostracised them. While in 1918 they sometimes lynched a man because he saw the madness of the world and thought America should remain at peace. Certainly they are unstable and unaccountable.

But to return to the Dream—it has become something easier to define to-day than in the past. To-day Americans feel that they come near to fulfilling the ideals of their country when they believe in democracy, in personal liberty, in freedom of speech and equal rights: when they set store by the ordinary tenets of justice: when they express the desire that every citizen should have an equal chance in life: and, finally, when they think that if any man has an idea he should possess the courage and be allowed the freedom to act upon it. The ideals have become a little more tangibly prosaic than they were. Indeed, the Dream sometimes appears to have changed from a vision fiery and unknowable into humdrum liberalism. Yet even if that is so, it still possesses something which lives to express the New World and is not to be found in the Old.

The change, such as it is, seems to have come about for various reasons. It dates probably from the Civil War. The New England spirit was responsible for a struggle which reduced the cavalier romanticism of the South to a secondary position in forming the ideals of the country as a whole. This struggle in the middle of the nineteenth century came about for reasons similar to those for which England had fought her Civil War two centuries earlier. The New England colonies had been peopled from the same stock as provided the spirit which led to the overthrow of monarchy in Stuart England. The northern settlers were men of a stamp to whom the atmosphere of royalty and privilege, as well as of its abuses, such as tyranny and oppression, was hateful.

But the gentlemen farmers of the southern States had many a younger son of an old English family among their forebears. They were men of a stock and philosophy that was alien to an America which took its idealism—and its greatness—from Puritan New England's dream. The Civil War was the beginning of the formation of an America different from any that had gone before. This was because the influence of Virginians and Southerners—

such as Washington himself—was to lose ground. They were fine gentlemen, those Southerners, but their ways of life and their outlook were something for which the New World was not intended to stand, and in their defeat the New World came more fully into its own.

The period, however, in which the old American idealism was to be at its greatest was not to last for long. Even though in the materialistic triumph of Northern commercialism over the rural Confederate South, the truest type of Americanism had also prevailed, there were other, stronger influences already at work to graft something new on to it and change it. All through those decades of the nineteenth century the Middle West and the West of the country were being colonised. And this meant new peoples. Germans, more Anglo-Saxons, a few Scandinavians, Finns, and an occasional Latin were landing now at Boston and New York. Their effect was to fulfil the old idealism and change it.

The men and women who came with their wagons to settle in Kansas and Nebraska—so potent a problem before the Civil War—and those who went on to Colorado and Wyoming, south-west over the Santa Fé trail and up north into the great wheat country where Minneapolis stands, were mostly of old American stock. The truest Americans were moving west in the latter part of the century; and in the West you find the oldest type of idealism to this day. The place of the people who moved west was often taken by the new-comers from overseas, and it was they who came more fully than anyone else into the heritage of the Northern victory in the Civil War. The Frontier that was being pushed always westward, till by 1890 it had reached those limits which now constitute the borders of the United States, was strong in keeping alive that outlook and sturdy American spirit which had begun to flourish even before the Declaration of Independence in 1776. Its influence affected every aspect of American life down to 1929, when the Expansion received its first great check in the collapse and recession of business. But it affected the outlook of the individual more than anything else.

And as counterpart it had the millions of new immigrants, some of whom took up the American way of looking at things in its entirety, while others were bound

to bring something of the spirit of the countries from which they had come to mix with that of their new world. The influence of this immigrant stream became more marked as its nature changed until after 1900 it included a very high proportion of Latin races and Central Europeans. For their outlook was profoundly different from that of the American, and more diverse from it than, by that time, was the Anglo-Saxon-Nordic.

The America of to-day is not only a product of the old peoples as well as of the new-comers, but is built on purposes of commerce. Wealth, great industrial wealth, came after the Civil War there—and, as we know well, had more visible effect on the face of the country than anything that had gone before it. Modern America combines the old concept that the individual is free and unfetterable with a new age in which the callous machine system reduces the human unit to a cog. Even this has not destroyed the Dream; yet it has altered it, as the Civil War did. But spiritually the new America which has evolved from all these forces is probably less far removed from our European civilisation than was the old. If even in those early days America was not completely cut off from Europe by her Dream, to-day, when that Dream has been modified by commerce, whose forces know no frontiers even between great nations, surely she is nearer than she was. The Dream, sullied, as some would have it, by commerce, binds her still.

The life that is led by millions of Americans naturally tends to make them a little heedless, even shortsighted, over broad questions such as that of their relationship with the outside world. As an Englishman on his way through the city of Des Moines in Iowa once remarked, 'There's no reason apparent to them in their daily life why they *should* care a tuppenny damn about Europe.' But what he had failed to observe was the fact that though the average American may appear to be no more than a man centred in his own surroundings, he is also an idealist. For his spiritual background is always there; he recognised something of it in 1917, and could do so again. Thus does his country remain a part of our civilised world.

There are, however, many to whom such arguments as these are not enough. They demand something more substantial. But their demand can be satisfied. There are



indisputable economic facts which prove America's links with the rest of the world. She exports and imports. Both are now essential to her economic system. Of the two, the imports are probably the more effective for the present argument. For there are a number of commodities which America needs yet cannot supply for herself. Rubber is the main one; it is grown in Brazil, Malaya, the Dutch East Indies, and Ceylon, but nowhere successfully in the United States. Then there are other commodities lacking such as coffee, sugar, wool, tea, silk, jute, and nickel. Nickel may be discounted, since it is imported from that world-supplier, Canada; and America is in a much better position to obtain it than any other country. Sugar, too, can be obtained in large quantities from near at hand—the islands of the Caribbean Sea, some of which belong to the United States. Sugar-beet also can be grown at home. Apart from these, her numerous mines do not provide America with all the many minor metals needed by modern science. Chromite, tungsten, manganese, antimony, tin, mica, and aluminium bauxite are generally lacking, also potash and nitrates.

It is conceivable that, given a rise in the price of the raw material, rubber and coffee and a greater quantity of wool could be produced in limited amounts within American territory. Silk too might be displaced to a certain extent by artificial silk; and synthetic rubber looks as if it might some day partly replace real rubber. Tea could probably be grown in limited quantities in the Southern States. Thus certain adjustments in theory could be made toward national self-sufficiency, if that were absolutely necessary. However, although the United States might in theory be economically self-contained if sacrifices were made, it would be impossible owing to climatic and soil conditions, and sometimes labour too, to produce the full amount of present American consumption in those spheres. Some real sacrifice would be essential.

On the other hand, it is undeniable that America does not lack raw materials to such an extent that she could not carry on if cut off from the rest of the world. And that is a remarkable position. But the clear practical answer to that attitude is simply that it could not be done. The necessary readjustments, curtailments, and exclusions

would arrest progress and put back development—which means that America would not stand for them and would not do them. As practical ideas they are untenable. No one who knows what America is and how her people live could deny this.

Then there are exports. Many maintain that America can only obtain her maximum prosperity on the maintenance of her export trade. In the days before she had built it up she would, of course, have attained her theoretical maximum without loading a single ship. But now, granted that there is a large volume of exporting business to be done, the readjustment necessary, if that were to be abolished permanently, would be almost impossible without a considerable loss of prosperity, for exports are woven into the texture of American trade, and even internal industry would be severely dislocated if they were to disappear. They consist mainly of motor-cars, wheat, and cotton, but they also include a whole variety of manufactured goods, which range—as we in Great Britain know to our cost—from radio sets to scissors. And they go, naturally, to balance America's essential imports.

Americans are apt to compare their country with Britain in this respect. They say, 'Look, you depend on your overseas markets for your whole economic balance, while our export is only from 8 to 10 per cent. of the total value of our produce.' But there are many sayings which illustrate the flaw in the main truth of that statement. 'It is the last inch on your nose which makes the difference,' is one of them. And while no country would be glad to see, say, 10 per cent. of its markets abolished without some strong reason and possible recompense elsewhere, America would naturally not be reduced to her knees by the loss of so small a proportion of her wealth. Views, however, on this point vary. Many responsible people hold that America *can* only obtain her maximum prosperity on a maintained export trade. They add sometimes that the extra amount of business and turnover made possible by exports is more than proportionate in lowering costs and in raising the standard of living through low prices due to maximum mass-production.

One of the most important points in connection with

American exports is not generally recognised. It is that, although over the aggregate volume and value of the country's production, exports only consist of about 8 or 10 per cent., certain parts of America are almost entirely dependent for their prosperity on conditions in that export trade. Take wheat and cotton, for example. It is reliably estimated that a tenth of the American population is dependent for its well-being and prosperity on the price of cotton. In the same way about an eighteenth is dependent on the price of wheat. If the price in each case is to be settled by demand and consumption overseas—where America can never have complete control—as well as by her internal conditions, then it is clear that her economic system is fundamentally linked with the general system. For the purchasing power of those branches of the American community falls when the prices of their products fall; and this is bound to react throughout the American system.

Then again, although only so small a proportion of American production goes abroad, Britain buys a large amount of it. In the past she has bought as much as 50 per cent. of America's exported cotton and 45 per cent. of her exported wheat. When trade conditions in Britain are bad, conditions in the States must necessarily be affected. If they cannot isolate themselves from the rest of the world, they would be glad to make the two Americas—North and South—between them economically self-sufficing and, in large measure, economically isolated from the rest of the world and particularly from Europe. So the argument runs, but even that cannot be done. Lines of trade have already been well-established between the South American republics and Europe. And even North and South America between them cannot provide certain commodities. Silk for one: and that very valuable modern necessity, rubber, for another. If they were isolated there would be practically no jute, flax, or tea; and a few of the minor metals mentioned as found little in the United States would still be scarce. Undoubtedly, moderately successful attempts could be made, if absolutely necessary, to produce some of those materials on American soil; but still some lack of them would be inevitable. The question, however, as we all know, is academic. In actual fact, the American Governments

will never try to isolate economically their continents, North and South, from the rest of the world, because it is evident that such an attempt could not succeed. The South American republics are nations and not mere colonies. Trade of some sort is bound to cross the Pacific and Atlantic oceans, so long as it is carried anywhere.

There is a second aspect of the question. The story of trade between the South American continent and the United States over the last fifty years is, first, that of the growing industrialisation of the States and afterwards—to-day—that of South America. Until 1900, for several obvious reasons, there was little of such mutual trade. South America was predominantly agricultural, and although the United States had many growing industries they could not supply all their own wants. There was nothing they had as a surplus to send to the south, and nothing, except a little coffee and some rubber, which they wanted from the south and could not themselves produce. Both sub-continent were agricultural in the main, and while the North could equip itself—but no more—industrially, the South bought its machines and railways from Europe. England played a part in that development, as also did Germany and France. Of the \$500,000,000 worth of goods imported by the South American republics in 1900, the United States, their nearest neighbour, sold them only \$41,000,000 worth.

Then things changed. Through the early years of the twentieth century, even to those immediately succeeding the World War, the South American economic system fitted into the industrialism of the United States as well as of the European countries. American industry was going full blast and rapidly outstripping its rivals in technical efficiency. It was at the height of its cheap labour boom and millions of Italians and southern Europeans were pouring in to the ports of Boston and New York. It rapidly assumed for itself a predominating position in South American trade, until, after the War, some people in the United States developed an economic Monroe doctrine which would make South America their own closed market.

American business men were about to develop to the full the potentialities of this market when in 1930

came another change. Two things happened. First, the bottom fell out of the New York market and American industry was reduced to a struggling shadow of its former self; and secondly—more important in the long run—the world-wide trend to self-sufficiency set in. Henceforth those republics which had been content to exchange raw materials for manufactured articles determined to start industries of their own, to make for themselves many of the goods which they had formerly imported. In these circumstances South America obviously could not remain the relatively open market for American goods that it had been. Add to this the fact that for a number of years, from 1930 onwards, the prices of South America's main products, such as coffee, rubber, and wheat fell disastrously, and it becomes clear that any thought of an economic Monroe doctrine had to be banished, at least temporarily, from the mind. And this, of course, is fundamentally where the idea of any economic isolation of the Americas must break down. For Brazil *must* sell her coffee, her rubber, and sugar, with other commodities produced in smaller quantities. Even if she wants to build up her own industries, she still must have a surplus of these primary products to export. So, too, Argentina must dispose of her meat and wheat. The other countries also have goods to sell, raw products by the returns on which they live. They cannot be cut off from European markets and be dependent on the United States alone.

So there is the whole economic argument. The United States cannot produce all the raw materials they need. The idea is put forward that these materials might be obtained exclusively from South America, and that in order to continue the isolationist ideal both the Americas—North and South—should be isolated economically from the rest of the world. But it cannot be done. The United States of America are, and must be, bound to the rest of the world by trade—as they are by history, ideals, and sentiment.

R. J. M. GOOLD-ADAMS.

# Art. 6.—THE VALUE OF STATE SOCIAL SERVICES.

'The first essential condition is to retrace a good deal of recent history.'—Report of the Royal Commission on Unemployment Assurance.

THE troubles which led to the formation of a 'National' Government sprang, according to the Committee presided over by Lord May, from the burden of the social services. That verdict has been forgotten. 'No politician could afford to endorse that view,' says Mr Pringle in his book 'The Nation's Appeal to the Housewife, and her Response.' 'The cause is not far to seek. In 1929 an article manufactured in this island and offered for sale in the markets of the world carried some 25 times the burden for social services that an American article carried . . . and yet a particular American family might have been found receiving a better social service than an English one.'

The value of the social services is largely assumed. Sir Kingsley Wood once spoke of the 'spectacular improvement in the national health' as due to them. Mr Arthur Greenwood was rash enough to say that in this century they had added three years of life, or hope of life, to 'every man, woman and child'; nor of all the shifting crowd of amateurs who have been appointed Minister of Health does there seem to be one who has not glorified the services. To crown all, the man who should guard the public purse, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, is now taking credit for maintaining them at their height at a moment of extreme financial urgency. Yet, if we read, as apparently these men do not, the reports of the permanent staff who have no need to keep an eye on votes, but ought merely to present the facts, scepticism as to their value is not only inevitable but an imperative duty. Far from suggesting that progress is due to the social services, these reports tend to intimate that on the whole they are impeding it, even at times to the point of arresting all advance.

In contrast with the complacency of the politicians, we are daily hearing that 'undernutrition in Britain is appalling'; that there is 'starvation in the midst of plenty'; that 'hundreds of thousands of families have too little money to buy the minimum for health'; and



much more to the same effect. Yet for fifty years the progressives have had it increasingly their own way. If there is a doubt whether national health has improved and much more so if it seems that it has deteriorated, they have failed. If it has improved, why all these complaints, especially from their own ranks, which are louder than they have ever been? They cannot have it both ways. If the complaints are just, their policy is at the bar of judgment and the presumption is that it is faulty.

One fact seems indisputable and a sure ground for complacency—the reduction of the death-rate, both total and infantile. But even that is not a simple matter. To begin with, a large factor in the reduction is due to the lower birth-rate. The first year of life is one of peculiar risk; even now it is at least four times, while it has been more than twelve times, the average. If the numbers of that class are reduced, it cannot but follow, and sensibly, that the average death-rate must be reduced; more especially if the infantile rate itself is much diminished. But the social services have never aimed at reducing the birth-rate. If they had done so it would be a desirable stock, the thoughtful, responsible parents, whom it would deter from rearing a family—affording so another instance, if it were needed, of the unfortunate results of ill-considered benevolence. There is further room for fallacy in the very reduction of infantile mortality. That had declined steadily to 1886–90, when it was interrupted by a series of outbreaks of epidemic diarrhoea. The older doctors will remember how in 1891–1900 more than a quarter of the total deaths were of babies and to the number of nearly one and a half millions. The conditions were exceptional, and should never recur. In 1901–5, as normality returned, there was a huge drop of 21 per 1000 born. Since then progress has gone on; in 1916–20 there was another drop of 20 per 1000 born, which is really greater than that in 1901–5; for it was measured against a normal decline; while that of 1901–5 was measured against an exceptional rise of mortality. In the respective quinquennia since 1920 the fall has been 14, 8, and 6, which last is a little better than that of 1861–70 and a little worse than that of 1881–90.

All England was shocked by the waste of life in 1891–1900; a campaign was started to combat it and much

legislation followed. When at the end of the decade the improvement became known the fallacy 'post hoc, ergo propter hoc' had its usual sway. But no candid observer can maintain that legislation had anything to do with the progress. There were pronounced declines before there was any legislation; after legislation, fluctuations were similar where it was adopted and where it was not; and when in 1912 the mortality fell below all previous record, there was a like fall in twelve European countries. It is part of the blindness which habitually credits the State with an improvement it could not have caused, that an improvement which did occur in the absence of legislation, like that in 1916, passed unnoticed except by permanent officials.

But the nation does not gain by a vitality which lasts only for the first year. To be of national service the vitality must be carried forwards. It was so to a large extent in the nineteenth century; has it been so in this? The following table shows how many extra lives were saved in the decades named, and how many more of these reached to ages 5 and 10 respectively in the succeeding ten-year periods per 10,000 born.

In 1871-80:	52 more reached age 1; 15 more age 5; 8 more age 10.
1881-90:	66 more reached age 1; 12 more age 5; 7 more age 10.
1891-1900:	9 <i>fewer</i> reached age 1; but 10 more age 5; 5 more age 10.
1901-10:	117 more reached age 1; but 7 more age 5; 4 more age 10.
1911-20:	114 more reached age 1; none more age 5; but 2 <i>fewer</i> age 10.
1921-30:	115 more reached age 1; but 2 more in 1931-5 reached age 5.

Everyone knows that our childhood population is decreasing; how many realise that it is decreasing relatively as well as absolutely, insomuch that at the end of 1931-5 much less than 3 per cent. of the lives prolonged over the first year reached age 5, as against 20 per cent. or more sixty and seventy years ago?

The official reports leave no doubt that there has been some setback at the younger ages. Thus the Registrar General's Decennial Supplement (1931) states that in

1911-21, while there had been progress in age group 5, its rate gradually diminished to ages 20 and 25, when for males the mortality equalled, for females exceeded, that of the previous decade. Beyond 25 the mortality was less than it had been; and, similarly, after 1921, resumption of progress all along the line was marked by the advance at the higher ages, until at the age of 50 there was only 80 per cent. of the mortality of the earlier period. The Registrar General suggests that such result means that lives had been saved—presumably by the advance of science—which under the earlier conditions would not have survived. But that leaves unexplained why the younger ages have not fully participated in the improvement, and throws no light on the comparative progress of the various groups before and after 1890. The following is the statement of the cumulative gains before and after 1890, reckoning the decadal averages for forty years on either side of the line.

Per 10,000

At ages ...	5	10	15	20	25	35	45	55	65	75
1851-90 ...	32	20	26	31	20	8	-6	-25	-33	+23
1891-1930	19	9	12	15	28	50	68	102	142	163

Can there be any other interpretation of these figures than that our fathers, faced with the effects of the Industrial Revolution, in their care for the present, secured the future for us, and that the superior vitality of the generations born under them accounts for the everyday experience that old age is generally more vigorous than it was fifty years ago? Had not Sir George Newman a moral in mind when in his farewell Report (for 1933) he said that age group 0-5 is that which has enjoyed 'a relative absence of direct action by the State,' and has made more progress in seventy-five years than any other? If he says further that 'age 2 is that of maximum susceptibility to environment'; if the mortality curve of a group so far advanced as 65 is from 1838 to date a faithful inverse of that describing the economic conditions which determined real wages sixty years back, is it not to be presumed that in some way the child's environment in the last century was being fast improved, while to-day there is some detrimental influence at work?

Taken together, these official observations confirm Sir George's further conclusion that adolescent mortality

has never declined in this century so fast as it did in 1860-90; and suggest that, apart from a relatively larger number of babies which have a prospect of surviving their first year, though not much longer, the only people who in this century have the hope of a longer lease of life are those who were born before the State social services became a burden. It is the poorer classes which are meant to benefit. There is not, nor has there been, any hint of deterioration in the young of the well-to-do. Insomuch as their deaths are part of the national total, they may so far be making the facts seem better than they really are. There is nothing in the statistics to disprove the assertion that the granting of old age pensions may have tended to lengthen lives already old; but there is as little to suggest that they helped to the attainment of old age. The suggestion of history is that the attainment of the seventies is influenced more by heredity than by environment.

The sharp line which the Registrar's tables draw at the end of 1920, progress beginning after age 25—apart from the infant group—points to some change in conditions which arose in 1891-1900. As we recede from 1895 the change becomes even more marked. That it is a change is strikingly evidenced by Mr Basil Henriques, whose long, devoted, and wise service in the East End entitles him to speak with authority. In his 'Indiscretions of a Warden' he says (p. 58): 'there is growing up a new type of child, whose poor physical calibre is only to be equalled by his poor mental calibre.' As occurring within his experience, the change necessarily synchronises with the era of the State social services; and it is in the district where in all England, if benefit there is, it should be greatest and most needed. But of all omens, surely the most sinister is that there should be a hint of deterioration in young women. The old among us have witnessed an astonishing enhancement of their vigour and physique. That owes nothing to direct State aid. It does owe much to the gradual disappearance of the conventions which forbade their participation in men's outdoor sports, and much also to the cheapening of the necessaries and of the amenities (as, for example, the cheap bicycle) of life. But to the continued progress of their vitality there has been a check which appeared for the

first time after the State has begun to play providence to them. Even in phthisis, it is clear that they are losing the advantage they enjoyed over males, in many, if not so far in all, districts.

If, without any State aid, with a much lower degree of scientific knowledge, and starting from a much lower base of health, the adolescent mortality decreased more rapidly than now, clearly the nutrition of the poorer classes must have been more nearly adequate than to-day, when the clamour for the provision of food by the public authority is incessant. It is worth while to pause a moment to see how far experience may guide us. Does it teach us to believe that the obvious individual gain of feeding on uneconomic terms the destitute child conduces to the advantage of the general community? At first sight it would seem impossible for the community to reap harm thereby. Meals provided by private charity, which discriminates wisely, plainly are beneficial; is it the same thing to provide food out of the rates? The question is an old one; but when education became compulsory and children were for the first time massed together it was forced on the public notice that widespread under-nutrition existed; and it was revived and eagerly debated.

No doubt many individual lives have been saved or prolonged by rate-provided meals; but that the systematic practice has been beneficial to the poor generally the subjoined tables cannot be said to suggest. The reduction of the mortality of children since the provision as a system became frequent, so far from being accelerated, has been retarded in spite of the prolongation of individual lives. Thus the mortality of age groups 5-10 fell:

1861-5 to 1881-5 from 4·7 to 3·2 per 1000; cumulative gain 1·5.

1886-90 to 1906-10 from 2·8 to 2·0 per 1000; cumulative gain 0·8.

1911-15 to 1931-5 from 2·1 to 1·4 per 1000; cumulative gain 0·7.

Similarly with age group 15:

1861-5 to 1881-5 from 6·6 to 4·6 per 1000; cumulative gain 2·0.

1886-90 to 1906-10 from 4·1 to 2·9 per 1000; cumulative gain 1·2.

1911-15 to 1931-5 from 2·9 to 2·5 per 1000; cumulative gain 0·4.

So many children below the age of 5 now attend school that probably it would have more direct influence to-day than formerly. To them also the mortality tables fail to afford any evidence of benefit resulting to the whole body. For the successive decades since 1861 to 1870 the cumulative gains have been respectively per 1000 : 1.5 ; 1.2 ; 1 ; 0.7 ; 0 ; 1.2 ; while for the five years 1931-5 it was 0.2 ; and in that five years practically the whole of the decrease of mortality as against its predecessor was in the last year, 1935, two years after the balanced budget. Thus the systematic feeding of school-children does not appear to have any traceable effect for good on the national scale ; and the tables rather confirm Sir George Newman's observation that the mortality of adolescence is being reduced less rapidly than it was. The recent decision to force children on leaving school under the same system of regimentation as their seniors in the Insurance Act, is the State's confession of the failure of the school inspections and the official care which in various ways they have received. If it had done good, why should they need this extra care, and why this energetic campaign 'made in Germany,' like the Act itself, for fitness ?

Consumption, i.e. tuberculosis due to the human type of germ, is perhaps an even better test of national progress ; for the infection is ubiquitous, everyone is exposed to it, most people have an attack, and most of them shake it off. Systematic investigation in the deadhouse of hospitals shows traces of invasion, cured, latent, or active, in the vast majority of cases. Invasion commonly occurs in childhood and may persist though inactive for a lifetime. Thus persons infected are more numerous than the young, and so more representative of the community. Generations of exposure have doubtless conferred a degree of immunity. Introduced into a community comparatively new to it, as, for example, the Canadian Indians, it is appallingly lethal ; but here, as with measles, it is often trivial in the individual cases though formidable in the aggregate. Many examples, some of them recent, show that a sensible lowering of the living standard may overpower the advance of scientific treatment and the acquired immunity. Even to-day, for all the advance, once the invasion has passed certain limits it is commonly



fatal. For the individual case the indication is to increase the resistance; it cannot be otherwise for the nation. And that chiefly means improving the nutrition, but that and all the other requisites are secured on the national scale if a high standard of real wages is ensured. That fact explains most of our history in the course of the disease and also why—as is known but little realised—in a highly protected country the mortality varies (*cæt. par.*) directly as the height of the tariff.

That it is a legitimate function of government to prevent disease is common ground. But the treatment of declared phthisis is not the prevention of phthisis. We know that with ordinary precaution the risk of direct infection is trivial. If ever it is a serious risk it is at the end of life, and the sanatoriums deprecate such cases being sent to them, when, if ever, they are a danger to others, for their object is to cure the individual not to prevent phthisis. But if the method employed involves the lowering of real wages, it may readily be promoting rather than preventing the disease in the general community. With an universal infection and every person a potential victim, the test of progress is the rate at which such victims are eliminated. If in this quinquennium the death-rate shows that only 100 fewer have died as against 200 fewer in the last quinquennium, the rate may have fallen absolutely; but there are at least 100 more potential victims left, and if the population is growing there will be more than 100. We jubilated when in 1912 the mortality fell below all records; but it was the eve of the gravest rise that we have seen.

That rise was no accident. From the beginning of this century it had been falling more slowly than the general mortality, instead of faster as it had been, and Karl Pearson correctly foretold that there would be a positive rise in 1915. Old doctors can testify how in the 'nineties many of us hoped, now that the cause was known, to live to see it disappear as a serious item in the national bills of health. But the elimination of potential victims has been slower in the era of social services than before. In the forty years before 1895 the rate fell from 2890 per million living to 1504. If we go back to 1838, the first year of records, there was an even more remarkable difference, namely a fall of 2484. In the forty years after 1895, with

the cause known, after much improvement in treatment and all the State services, it has fallen by 832. Though deaths are fewer, notifications do not equally diminish, and the Ministry is complaining that the proportion of cases which become known to them only at the point of or after death does not sensibly vary ; so that there must be a number of unrecognised cases among us.

In home or foreign records it is possible to trace a relation between pronounced fluctuations of the mortality and economic causes. Between 1838 and 1895 there was no quinquennium in which the reduction of the potential numbers of fatal cases was so small as it has been in this century, except the two in 1861-70, when the economic stress of the American Civil War and of the cotton famine was severely felt here. That relation to economic conditions has not been better illustrated than it was unconsciously by Koch, when he showed that at the time he spoke, in 1910, there were three exceptions to the rule of a general decline of mortality. His information was not up to date. If it had been he would have known that in two of the exceptions the mortality was again falling, the wage-rate having been for some time rising ; while in the third, as control experiment, the wage rate had continued to fall with the mortality rising. By common consent poverty is the crux of the problem.

So much the 'Progressive' concedes and, indeed, takes for granted. But he forgets that the men who engineered the long, steady rise in wages, great in money, greater still in value, for more than fifty years, taught that State benefits must tend to lower wages in the real sense. That long rise, unprecedented in modern industrialism and at the expense of profits, justifies their thesis and is beyond question. Equally beyond question is it that the generations born under their régime have to-day a conspicuous advantage over the generations born under the new régime.

Lasting, widespread unrest must indicate some real grievance. Unrest, unemployment, complaints of grave under-nutrition have—with one interval during and shortly after the War—prevailed continuously since 1905. They have been in direct ratio to the effort of the State to obviate them. The rent strike now threatening against so many landlords and more especially municipal

landlords is but the latest illustration of the futility of attempting permanently to relieve poverty out of rates or taxes. Even if individuals gain from such attempts, the mass must suffer. They may relieve unemployment by the creation of officials to order other men's lives ; but the officials are the one contribution of a permanent kind to that problem and they are the one class which unequivocally gains. To effect this contribution to the problem a mortgage is executed on the future.

But by 1914 much of the debt for the Napoleonic wars was still unpaid. The Great War multiplied that tenfold and the peace has added since more than has ever been added, save once, in time of war. That takes no account of national commitments, such as the contingent liabilities on the Post Office and Trustee Savings Banks, the Friendly Societies, and the guaranteed loans of various kinds. Nor does it touch on the portentous municipal debts, which bear more directly and perhaps more hardly on the poor. Add to it that the yearly State expenditure is now nearly double the pre-War National Debt ; add the heavy rates we are called upon to pay ; then calculate the legacy we are going to leave to a posterity whose numbers are almost certain to be less than ours. Could reckless cruelty go further ?

Threatening as are conditions to-day, no one will pretend that they are so desperate as they must have seemed to politicians just before 1834 on the eve of the abolition of the Old Poor Law. But our fathers showed that they could make the future of England secure while they took thought for their present ; that the two are really inseparable. The *laissez-faire* politicians who are the object of scorn to-day left behind them less debt than they had inherited ; the success of their work for the national health shines out in the mortality tables to-day, to prove their wisdom and forethought. There is no escape from the dilemma ; we must retrench or inflate—which is, after all, but deferring the day of retrenchment. It is not practical politics just now to talk of curtailing armaments. Nor is there any hope of Labour consenting to the curtailment of the social services until its members relearn the lesson they knew perfectly well sixty years ago, and recognise that they do not pay them as a body, that they lower real wages, and since brisk demand

and low real wages do not go together, must make for unstable employment; while all the State can give they can provide for themselves, with the added incalculable advantage that such self-provision makes for higher standard of living, for health and happiness, for the sanctity of family life and the abolition of class distinctions. Fortunately we can still hear from working men, even from Labour M.Ps. now and then, 'We can do better for ourselves than the State can.' That remark, in the writer's experience, is most frequently heard in regard to the Insurance Act, ironically named 'Health.' Therein lies one gleam of hope of a return to the great old days when working men 'looked not to Parliaments but to themselves.'

That Act was to improve health. But from the first it was urged that it would so depress real wages that it would be prejudicial on balance to health, especially of the children. Certainly it did depress real wages and quickly so. By 1914 my conclusion, based on a large number of enquiries, was that a working man with a family was paying from 1s. to 2s. a week in raised prices alone, without counting the contribution which in the vast majority of instances he had been voluntarily paying. Further in 1911 it was correctly foretold that the mortality from phthisis would rise in 1915; and when in 1916 it was clear that money wages had outstripped prices that the rise would cease in 1918, war or no war. It is for the friends of the Act to demonstrate the fallacy, if there is any, in these forecasts. They will further have to show why the rising mortality of young children was first checked in 1916; why at the end of the decade the children born in 1916 made the best showing of any class born since 1895; why the great Benefit Societies have been constantly asking how it is that an Act to diminish sickness should end in increased sickness; why in the fifteen years ending with 1935 the average duration of sick benefit should have risen from 16.5 days to 28 in the year; why it should be possible for Scottish experts to say that 'in some cases sickness is more refractory, in others to some extent increasing; the chronic cases (i.e. lasting a year or more) were, in 1930, 14 per 1000; in 1935-6 they had reached 19 per 1000; and it is noteworthy that the increase was relatively most marked at

younger ages' (i.e. below age 35)\*; and why in 1918 the rejections for the Army were 40 per cent. of a population of the less fit, while in 1935 they amounted to 62 per cent. of the ordinary population. In late years, without counting the first four days in which there is no benefit, there have been some 30,000,000 weeks' work lost through sickness. Of course to-day the wage depressant effect is overlaid by many other burdens. But it must be working still, even if underground.

All this and much more has to be accounted for. In a word, since 1912, with the same doctors, with a great advance in medical science, with added State care, but also with an added State burden, the figures show that the results are inferior to what they were, which is another instance to prove that the working class can do better for themselves than the State can. If it comes to a matter of charity, is there any instance where the Charity Organisation Society has ever increased sickness among its beneficiaries? The dilemma cannot be escaped. Either this increase is real or a sham, indicating moral deterioration. Either alternative is an indictment. More than one Minister of Health plead the latter; alternatively that it is due to unemployment and self-pity. The plea is bad, for it was an objection to the Act that it would tend to promote unemployment. To bring about such a result a burden now far greater than the pre-War National Debt was imposed on industry at one stroke. Is there any sense in retaining the compulsion?

The relief to industry, if it were made optional, would be immediate and immense. It could not be long before we saw an improvement in employment, in real wages, in the health of young children, and later in that of adolescents. More important still, it would be an object lesson to the nation. It was the longest step backwards we had ever taken, pointing not vaguely to a retrogression from the industrial to the militarist society. The regimentation it enforces falls in with the conception of human society as identical with a 'colony' of lowly organisms, such as the corals or the ants. But until it can be proved that an individual among these organisms can strike out an autonomous line for itself, the analogy fails and misleads.

---

\* 'Journal of the Royal San. Inst.,' Dec. 1937, pp. 375-7.

Long ago Aristotle told us how he was hearing, as we hear to-day, that the institution of private property was the root of our evils ; but, he said, it lies deeper than that, in the wickedness of men. So much the 'progressive' admits ; but the wickedness is always in other men, and he essays to make them act as if they were good and up to the progressive standard. The attempt has often been made, always has failed, always must fail. It only controls externals ; except as a rule injuriously the spirit it does not touch. Democracy for its success depends on a constantly rising ethical standard. It makes a more stringent demand on the individual than any other system ; and to the individual its appeal must always be directed. The sphere of government 'has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished.' It is a biological fact of evolution, not less than that the appendix has in man become a rudimentary organ, that evolution to the higher type has always meant increase of differentiation in place of standardisation and that man's differentiation has reached its zenith in that, unlike the lower creation, his sympathy for others has passed the limits of his family during its dependence on him and becomes wide. In simple terms freedom is the respectful and sympathetic recognition of the claims of others.

At no time in the history of the world has such recognition been so cordial and spontaneous as when central control has been least exercised. At this juncture, when scarcely any large business firm is without its welfare schemes, its pensions, sick benefit, or other plan to ensure its employees' security and prosperity, it is impolitic as well as ungenerous not to acknowledge that it is due to the momentum of the changed attitude of capital to labour, which under the conditions of modern industrialism taught that the interests of the two are inseparably united, that high wages may be cheap wages, and that the contentment of the workman may be a great asset to the employer. At several times in world history such conditions have obtained ; but never have they been more fruitful than in England when for a time governments had learned to lift their meddlesome and mischievous hands.

B. G. M. BASKETT.



## Art. 7.—THE SACRED FIRE.

1. *Matthew Arnold*. By Carleton Stanley. President of Dalhousie University: Toronto University Press, 1938.
  2. *The Sacred Fire: An Anthology of English Poems from the Fourteenth Century to the Present Day*. Chosen and arranged with an Introduction. By William Bowyer Honey. Routledge, 1939.
  3. *Æschylus: The Persians (Persæ)*. Translated into English rhyming verse with Preface and Notes. By Gilbert Murray, D.C.L. Allen and Unwin, 1939.
  4. *Dante's Purgatorio*. With a Translation into English triple rhyme. By Laurence Binyon. Macmillan, 1938.
  5. *Orion and other Anonymous and Hitherto Unpublished Poems attributed to John Keats*. Transcribed by Bristol Williams. Missouri International Mark Twain Society, 1939.
  6. *Charister*. By Violet Clifton. Hague and Gill, 1938.
  7. *Last of the English and other New Poems*. By Lord Gorell. Murray, 1939.
  8. *The Collected Poems of Cecil Floersheim*: Hove, Combridges, 1939.
  9. *The Collected Verse of Thomas Thorneley*: Cambridge. Heffer, 1939.
  10. *Mirage Water*. By Lord Dunsany. Putnams, 1938.
  - 11 and 12. *Kingdom of Earth. Poems*. By Wilfred J. Plumbe. And *The New Road and Other Poems*. By Geoffrey Johnson. Williams and Norgate, 1939.
  13. *Stony Ground. New Verse on an Old Theme*. By Eisdell Tucker. Macmillan, 1938.
- And Other Works.

THESE have not been easy days or months for those who work in the arts. Beset by threats of war and poisonous propaganda, with the clamour of bombing-machines filling the skies and our loveliest parks made ugly through new mud-heaps called trenches, it seemed as if the bad old gods, unchecked by time or any other considerations, were preparing to fulfil the ultimate tittle of their gospel of blood and hate, an impression that we now find was true. . . . So what chances have the arts enjoyed to be worthy of themselves? In such conditions how can artists dream

and discover the inspirations that are necessary to their endeavours ?

We have come in the later years to what cricketers call a bad patch in cultural effort and productiveness. In painting, music, sculpture, poetry there have been many freaks and poverties—efforts which found boldest expression in the complacent works of what a brilliant Frenchman called the Cult of Incompetence ; according to whose tenets established rules could be wildly ignored and it was called freedom, while the realities of nature made so distorted and queer that many in the crowd—blinder even than Milton's 'blind mouths'—were induced to believe they were instances of a reckless and therefore semi-divine originality. We experience, in consequence, paintings determinately ill-daubed and out of drawing ; music which drivels along without melody, meaning, or coherence ; sculpture which represents the image of God as rather like that of a scarred baboon ; and as to poetry, Mr Thomas Thornely, whose 'Collected Verses' we shall look at later, puts a fair view of things into the mouth of the 'ultra-modernist poet' :

'We tack no more of meaning to our song  
Than clings to motions of a drifting log,  
Form, grammar, rhyme we spurn, such gauds belong  
To simpering bard and brain-drugged pedagogue.

'What else is left us ? Gone are codes and creeds,  
And smug conceits that waked Victorian lyres ;  
Mind is for us a string of worthless beads,  
And life a fatuous round of balked desires.'

We propose to examine some of the better—by which we mean the more competent and less unruly—examples of verse that have recently come to us. Few of these efforts, let us say in passing, would have drawn Omar's thoughts from the Wine and the 'Thou' of his wilderness—but never mind that ! It is something that with all the blusterings and boisterousness the flame of inspiration has not quite gone out.

Our examples are not highly representative of the large output which, despite the uncertainties, continues to flow from the presses, for much that is excellent and recently published is not on our list ; but what we have will serve as samples of the good, the competent, and the indifferent

that are hopefully written and printed and offered to readers. The pretentiously bad, the grotesque in thought and style that are the consequences of inexperience or silliness we put aside ; as although it might be amusing to quote them, it is a heartless job to ridicule the crudenesses that often have sprung from sincere intentions. We are, therefore, not lightening our prose with extracts of extravagances whose meaning is a confused and often comic nothing.

Before we come to our examples of recent verse, let us briefly consider two volumes the contents of which establish standards—as is not unimportant, for much of the bad verse offered and suffered would not have been penned if its writers had known more of the greatness of English poetry and so had gained a truer appreciation of values and proportions. The first of these volumes consists of a series of lectures on Matthew Arnold delivered by Dr Carleton Stanley, the President of Dalhousie University in Nova Scotia ; the second is an anthology of English verse, 'The Sacred Fire,' compiled by Mr William Bowyer Honey. In their different ways these works provide standards by which modern verse-writers might well test themselves and so renew hopes that when the present troubles and anxieties have passed and artists again can approach Carlyle's *Eternal Verities* unhampered by guns and Goebbels, our young poets may write verse worthier of their aspirations and the national heritage of Literature.

Matthew Arnold is entitled to that high place among the established which, if we may put it so, he did not quite attain ; and Dr Stanley, with refreshing eloquence and a vigour that sometimes, however, inconsequently thumps, while over Ireland he is apt to be far less than fair to Great Britain, makes out an excellent case for Arnold's restoration from the indifference that has widely befallen him. He recognises the inopportune years, 'the most terrible period in modern England,' wherein Arnold laboured and sang, with their harsh, practical earnestness, rapid progress in material wealth and frequent political meanness and class-prejudice—all of which provided an environment depressing to so solitary, proud, and sensitive a spirit. His output in verse and nervously expressive prose, of course, was uneven ; but did not Homer some-

times nod and Shakespeare perpetrate the humours of the Dromios? His very unevenness may, indeed, be taken as an indirect mark of his high quality, as that excellence helps to make the weaknesses more evident. In his best work we discern fine austerities in mood and thought, a delicate choice of the right words, and a style that often sings as Wordsworth and Milton sang, than which there can be no better. For he wrote with essential nobility in the grand style, the great manner, and thereby showed a right faith in his own powers; while he had as well the imagination which enabled him to see the realities to which lesser and more hurried people are contentedly blind. As Wordsworth was aware of Triton blowing his wreathed horn; so Arnold, as in 'The Strayed Reveller,' could witness the gods in their happiness, the Centaurs snuffing the mountain wind and old Silenus lolling in the sunshine—

'. . . while his Fauns  
Down at the water-side  
Sprinkled and smooth'd  
His drooping garland.'

But it is with his rigorous sense of dignity and self-discipline that Arnold best may help the young ambitious poets of to-day; and if they took to heart the lessons he teaches how much that is drivel and verbal jazz we should avoid, to the enrichment of the waste-paper basket.

Poetry, however, being universal its ranges of theme and ways of treatment are not to be limited. Every style is permissible and required in it. Of this we are reminded by the many anthologies produced; and it is a good sign and encouraging that such productions—to please all tastes, as the enterprising in commerce say—are sold in numbers sufficient to encourage their continuance. The trouble with such collections of verse is that the ideal one never can be written. There must be omissions and inclusions made which some will question or lament; and that is so with Mr Honey's compilation, 'The Sacred Fire'; but as he claims that his choice was with purpose made not representative, we have nothing more to say of that. The book is his; the theories he advances in his frank and fresh-minded Introduction make out a case, and he is entitled to use whatsoever examples he pleases

to prove it. Yet we do feel that in selecting his moderns—ever a debateable section—which in his case begins with Francis Thompson, he might have included more than one woman, Charlotte Mew.

Our immediate interest in his anthology is, however, given mainly to its value in providing standards by which the verse-makers of to-day, who have not quite found their feet—or wings—might helpfully be inspired; though not to the extent of our ignoring the claims that he makes as to the true nature of poetry. He limits its values, perhaps a little harshly; but that is a fault to be commended as compared with the sloppiness of so much hasty 'opinion.' He follows the progress of English verse from its beginnings, before or with Geoffrey Chaucer, when the language, which has become an instrument so mighty and delicately modulated, was still in the processes of being formed. From those early outpourings until now he recognises its progress as a series of successive impulses, every one in turn being exemplified in the divisions of his book. In true poetry he looks for

'the impulse to rhythmical speech . . . united to a conscience and sensibility that reject all language and imagery that are not fire-new, as it were, and beyond this there must be that positive creative gift by which words and images can be chosen and arranged in precisely that order whose poetical significance and music we can recognise if not so easily define. Without this gift not the most sensitive taste and intelligence, nor metrical ingenuity and skill, nor extensive vocabulary and facility, nor vision alone can ever make a poet.'

Beyond those conditions of instant sensitiveness and an inspired creativeness there must also be in pure poetry imaginative reason and fire fused to white heat, spontaneous, irrepressible, through which the most everyday language may be transfigured; so that 'every word may be given a life of its own and out of the amorphous matrix of common speech the jewel of poetry may be crystallised.' Even that brief statement of Mr Honey's theories shows how determinately he limits the range of poetry and how few of our present verse-makers according to his theories are better than fumbling imitators or poetasters. For their comfort, if comfort it be, let it be said that in this rigorous putting-aside they go

with many whose names for years to come will shine brilliantly among our constellations. Amongst them are Swinburne, who with many gifts had in his writings an 'empty clang' (as nobody can deny), and, through many of their passages, also Shelley and Emily Brontë—she being made to suffer the more through her Christian name being bracketted 'Emily (or Branwell)'—surely the most unkindest cut of all!—while Matthew Arnold's poetic capacity, it is pointed out, was a 'smaller gift,' a passing judgment that should furnish Dr Carleton Stanley with a further store of thunderbolts. Even Wordsworth, who has at times 'a serene perfection and simplicity of utterance which sustains us through long passages which as meaning are as empty as anything (he) ever wrote,' is included in this partial condemnation. From which remarks it is clear that our anthologist requires from his poets exacting conditions—and so much the better for the true art of poetry in view of the evident self-complacency with which M. Faguet's Incompetents pen their stuff.

What, in brief, Mr Honey looks for in poetry, as we have a right to hope to find in all the arts, is the expression of genius. Even cleverness is not enough; nay, is not only insufficient but is often a cause of added distress. Too many young people of to-day are so easily damned with that word 'clever.' And he is right in insisting on high powers and qualities and looking for the inward flame, the impulse of passion, the sacred fire—added to the enchantment through which the poet with his music of words is able to give them 'a significance beyond intelligent meaning.' That is additionally a hard saying, but yet it is true; and 'it is this music, this pattern which, like beauty of every kind, has something in it of Divinity more than the ear discovers.' If we, therefore, do not often discern that element of divinity in the verse we meet we yet are entitled always to look for it, even with some severity of attention.

With such ideals in mind the aim of the poet necessarily becomes more difficult; yet it should not be otherwise. His themes (and we are taking him seriously) are universal; a condition at once shown in the two books next on our list. These are translations of supreme utterances; whereon at once the challenge is apt to be made, How can translations of poetry be equally poetry in that



other language? The answer is clear; it may not be poetry of equal merit, but if the translator is a poet it still may be and should be poetry. That, however, is a rare condition, through the want of which poor Heine possibly has suffered more than any other lyrical writer; while, sleeping beside the inkpot as we write, is another volume of translations of German verse so badly done and therefore untrue to the originals that it would be ungenerous to point criticism at what is surely an ingenuous murdering of honest wood.

The first of these examples of greatness 'put into English' is the 'Persæ' of Æschylus, translated by Dr Gilbert Murray. An old and practised hand at this employment, the translator is too fine a Greek scholar, with an ear well-attuned to the right cadences and music of verse, to be guilty of any untrue or burdened phrasing. Reading this little book as if it were merely an original offering of English verse, as can be the only right way, one is impressed by its vigour, dignity, and colour. In these lines we are able to discern the impression of great emotion as well as of that simplicity which made the supreme Greek tragedies so inexorably true. Passing to Mr Laurence Binyon with his translation into English triple rhyme of Dante's 'Purgatorio' we feel that he has undertaken a more difficult task than Dr Murray, whose intellectual life has been steeped in Hellenic literature, history, and lore. Mr Binyon, as we know, has given a valuable career to the service of the British Museum and in his poetry visited many regions with distinction of thought and heart. He has never treated his muse with carelessness or approached with any irreverence the exaltations of his theme, whatever were its subject and range. But is not Dante, at least in his 'Divine Comedy,' untranslatable? There have been efforts beyond counting in all manner of forms and metres to dress him up in English and often as verse they have been estimable; but it is hard to believe that the 'Purgatorio,' and even more so the 'Paradiso,' can be fitly put into any other language than that which came from the patriotic and mediæval Italian heart of its maker. Possibly the method of rhythmical prose used by the late Dr Philip Wicksteed and his colleagues in their collaborations, published in the Temple Classics, brings us nearest

to the spirit of the original ; but that is a question of comparisons which does not now concern us. Mr Binyon is too true a poet, sincere and careful, not to make his work good and at times better than good ; but partly through the monotony of these verses we have liked much of his earlier work more than this.

With a glance at 'Orion and other Anonymous and Hitherto Unpublished Poems attributed to John Keats,' which are not by John Keats, though undoubtedly they were penned by one so imbued with the love and knowledge of him that he was able to write, though without music, magic, or inspiration, somewhat distantly after his fashion—compare the Sonnet on the Nightingale here with the Ode and note the differences !—we return to Dante, or to an aspect of the immeasurable Mantuan as seen by Mrs Violet Clifton. It is ever hazardous to evoke the spirits of immortals and invent words for their mouths. That Mrs Clifton has unusual gifts of intellect and imagination with others that are required by an authentic poet is so true that we wish she had exercised them on a theme which admitted no Dante ; for her Dante is no more our Dante than our Dante is likely to be anyone elses. Therefore, why did she not summon from the vasty deep to which all poets with imagination have the key some unrecognisable shadow who would have been safer for her consultations on eternal things ? She, or the Woman of her theme, 'sings Charister,' because of Christ's winged charity, and in the course of her chanting dialogues inquires into spiritual conditions. During the discourse between herself and Dante she also allows her soul to speak in its three distinctive aspects of sense, thought, and will and thereby approaches still nearer to the shadows and the immensities. Her best canto is probably the twenty-first, which brings the wondering reader well back to Earth ; but through its fullness that one is not conveniently quotable ; so, for examples of the style of thought and the scope of this soaring poem we cull two stanzas of the four in which the 'Thought-part of the Soul' sings :

' Man as creator  
I transform, and I bewing ;  
amend stallion-nature  
that Pegasus may sing.

All furtherance of being,  
lengthening of measure  
all deepening of seeing  
are of my treasure. . . .

' Naked, alone  
with beast to tame ;  
the Parthenon to raise ;  
planets to name ;  
the Trinity to praise ;  
man, reasonable mind,  
most valiant bard,  
echoes, inspired by me,  
Adonaian word  
and half in song, half sigh  
makes that dread utterance :  
" I." '

Of the other living poets whose recent works we are considering, Lord Gorell's in view of its bright variety and comprehensiveness is the most satisfying. He is bold and without hesitancy he ventures over very wide ranges. He has lived a versatile life—tinker, tailor, soldier, sailor, and all that—and been serviceable in many public causes ; while the Great War with its heroisms and bitterness wrought on his sensitiveness and troubled much of his thought. As a poet he appears to find music wherever he goes and through sheer industry in trying all manner of forms and improving in workmanship as he continues has developed admirable faculties of insight and delicate expression. This volume reveals him in many moods and verse-forms, from epigrams in quatrain to a lengthy narrative in blank verse, ' The Last of the English,' which, as an American friend has declared to him, really represents their racial and spiritual continuity, as is shown through the examples in widely separated succession of Harold, Sir Thomas More, and Mrs Brown of Bermondsey. This is an interesting and successful venture, with its examples of the patriotic and unconquerable English spirit as displayed at Senlac, in the quiet spiritualities of the gross Henry's saintly but ever most human Lord Chancellor, and in the genial Cockney woman, who with her cup o' tea ' had dreams.' Lord Gorell has done this work well and we hope he will be encouraged to bring within its scope other historical

and social episodes that illustrate the deathless qualities of our people : but on the whole we feel that he is happiest when his theme is of simple love or nature, though his gift for gentle irony—and modern irony rarely uses the lash—is brought out in ' Vigil ' :

' Squat on his haunches in the heated cage  
The great ape watches with deep-sunken eyes  
The denizens of this all-conquering age  
That long from every truth has torn surprise,  
Enslaved the elements, made Space and Time  
Subservient to the whim of its decrees,  
Rifled the atom, plundered the sublime,  
And tossed to air the old simplicities.

' Along the length of barrier idling by  
The world lays siege to him : with winks and nods  
And threadbare zest at hirsute ancestry  
Before him saunter the incurious gods.  
Slow, shapeless thoughts, like phantoms in a stream,  
Enfold their strength about him squatting there ;  
He views the long procession as in dream,  
This giant of the dim, dark forest-lair.

' He is the first, the father, and his mind  
Mirrors the virgin world before the light :  
He looks upon the march of all mankind,  
The turbulent and tortuous climb from Night.  
A throneless king, a solitude apart,  
His subjects pass him all his pristine days ;  
He has unending vigil in his heart  
And all Earth's load of sorrow in his gaze.'

And now for a taste of Lord Gorell's quality in his most characteristic vein, when he finds himself among the lovelier simplicities with the second of his ' Brevities ' :

' The lane is hung with stars to-night ;  
Immensity is in the gloom,  
Silent, sweet-scented—ringed with light,  
Love walks with two where hedge-flowers bloom ;  
Unswayed, the leafy branches loom,  
Like Fates, above their lips : their hour,  
The frailest, fleetest mortal dower  
Is compassed with unearthly power ;  
Eternity enfolds its flight  
And Time surrenders his long doom.'

The next two volumes on our list have a pleasantness of their own. The 'Collected Poems' of Mr Cecil Floersheim and the 'Collected Verse' of Mr Thomas Thornely were written, it is clear, for the joy of the work and, therefore, if they failed to discover the finer ecstasies or have no more than occasional flickerings of the sacred fire that Mr Honey looks for, they yet have an unfailing freedom from carelessness. Mr Floersheim's is posthumous. Often it reminds the reader of earlier poets, especially so with 'Ruth,' which for its untroubled narrative might have been Tennyson's, written in that less-inspired mood which produced amongst other conscientious narratives, 'The Gardener's Daughter.' The fact that Mr Floersheim cultivated this gift in private for only his friends to read the results is engaging and revealing in its modesty and sincerity. His most original efforts are in epigram form, and these are neat, as with 'On a Criticism of Mozart's "Magic Flute"':

'What Wagner loved, this scribbler for the masses  
Seeks idly to disparage. It appears  
In music still some critics are but asses,  
Or would be if they only had the ears.'

Mr Thornely's verse has more warmth and less finish than that of Mr Floersheim and although he appears to fly more easily he is apt at times also to be more pedestrian. He gives so abundantly, his pages are so full, that the good effect would probably have been greater if he had printed less: but it is something to have verse written with heart and, like Lord Gorell, he evidently loves to make experiments in the many forms. He has a pretty dislike of the modernists in verse, as the epigram quoted earlier shows; and for the rest he reveals a happy regard for the kinder and nobler things of life. As fair an illustration as any to be gathered from his pages are the closing stanzas, added, in 1936, to a poem written in 1919, when the 'Big Four'—whose stature has dwindled, as that even of supermen, which they were not, must do—were making or mismaking their treaty at Versailles.

'Alas, these hopes were vain;  
Man still must hunt his fellow-man;  
Still sound the hell-shod hoofs of Tamerlane,  
Tramplings of Ghengis Khan.

'Had more magnanimous views prevailed  
And vengeful thoughts been thrust aside  
Hopes that upheld us fighting had not failed,  
Nor millions vainly died.'

'Mirage Water,' the title of Lord Dunsany's somewhat uneven volume, is appropriate, as it presents the truths of life touched with the faint silvery lights of elfin illusion. We expect so much from this author's rare powers of imagination and vivid style that when his work a little disappoints it disappoints much. Anyone expert in verse might have written some of the poems in this volume; but often the authentic note appears—like Pan with his grin looking out of a thicket to mock our worldly issues—and then we read something which only Lord Dunsany could have done. How delicate are these stanzas, chosen at random, 'On a Tea-pot of Chien Lung!' In thought and expression and the ultimate shrewd climax it is thoroughly his.

'I saw a peony  
Upon a tea-pot drawn,  
Pale pink as mists the sea  
Sends landward from the dawn :

'Two petals, unaware  
Of their appointed hour,  
Fell, and on wings of air  
A wasp flew to the flower ;

'Another hung inert  
Upon a lazy breeze.  
Ah ! How shall we convert  
The ignorant Chinese ?'

With Mr Wilfred Plumbe's 'Kingdom of Earth' we return to Nature in her simplicities and many-voiced exultations. He opens with a challenging Preface and illustrates the truths he there proclaims by singing of the realities of hills, woods, fields, and streams and their abounding wild-life with an enjoyment that heartens. He glories in Nature as she is, and knows that her realities need no artifice to make them beautiful. It is another instance of the importance of not over-looking the obvious, for are not these wonderful actualities crowded before our senses ?



"Age of machines"—They din  
their dictum at our ears.

'Yet what machine can spin  
tendrils and fronds? close  
clover foil? erect a tower  
like the foxglove plant?  
rob the year's  
pollen of its power  
or milk a rose?'

That's a question which leaves the so-clever folk dumb, and is expressive of the brave wisdom that animates this little book. Mr Geoffrey Johnson's 'The New Road' is more sophisticated; not quite so free in its lyricism, not quite so convincing. He too recognises the truth which more or less appears in the thought of all these poets, that the newly-fashionable are not necessarily the best judges of anything; and in the good cause hurls a lance at the 'reactionary rebels,' the small and noisy people who assert the stupid faiths of the Cult of Incompetence:

'They spurn the finished Phidias, praise the raw  
Quarries it rose from; spurn the lords of words  
Who walked the weltering waves imposing law,  
And ape the jargon of chaotic herds.

'And for the cavemen crawling in the smoke  
Dethrone the Raphaels, rip down aureoles,  
And by the songs of lively dirt invoke  
The gods to see the squalor of their souls.'

Finally, we come to Mr Eisdell Tucker with his 'Stony Ground.' Its writer has a fund of searching irony that frequently reminds us of 'The Spoon River Anthology.' He sees the meannesses and silliness behind the masks and poses, the truths beyond the fading epitaphs, and points their moral; while perhaps through the very shrewdness of his discernment he is keener to see the loveliness too. He has more tenderness than Mr Edgar Lee Masters, as we find is best expressed in 'These Little Ones,' which, however, requires more space for quotation than can be permitted. Failing that, here is 'Little Flowers and Little Weeds,' to give a taste of his gently ironic quality:

' Find me a nice clean leper  
I said,  
not too far gone in his disease  
yet with a spot somewhere  
that he can decently display,  
and I will embrace him gladly  
for love of Saint Francis.

' But alas ! I only found one  
with the right qualifications  
and he was most ungrateful.  
Not only did he object  
to what he called distasteful publicity,  
but when we parted  
he made me a present of his bell and clapper,  
so that the neighbourhood,  
he said,  
might be warned in time  
of the approach of Holy Poverty.'

So ends our appreciation for this year of some of the better works of verse that have come to us. They show that poor as these days may have been in the higher exaltations of the spirit and discovering little of the sacred fire that Mr Honey looks for, there still is true music, freshness, and sincerity among the poets who, in spite of discouragements due to political uncertainties and harshness and the growing mechanisation of the times, refuse to surrender their ideals, but strive still to enjoy the things of beauty that, on the assurance of John Keats, last for ever. So long as such earnestness continues there is hope even that greatness in poetry may return.

C. E. LAWRENCE.

# Art. 8—THE IRISH REPUBLICAN ARMY.

THE Irish Republican Army is not an army. It is a terrorist secret society. It makes use of military titles for its officials and of military descriptions for the divisions of its organisation, but the titles and descriptions are arbitrary. A brigade may consist of twenty men in one district and of five hundred in another. A battalion may number six or sixty. A captain's area may be a few scattered cottages on a hillside or the suburb of a city. Some units may include as many officers as men. To understand the I.R.A. and its operations it is necessary to disregard the conventional meaning of the word 'army.' The I.R.A. claims to be a military force. It describes itself as the army of the Irish Republic, and regards itself as the continuation of the irregular forces which fought the Free State troops after the Articles of Agreement for a Treaty had been signed in 1922 by representatives of the British Government and of Sinn Féin. Those irregular forces in their turn had claimed that they were the real I.R.A. which had fought against the Crown Forces in 1916 and from 1919 onwards, though the Free State army had an equally direct descent from the original I.R.A. The origin of all the armies which Ireland has known in the last twenty-three years—apart, of course, from the British army with its Irish regiments—had been the 'Irish Volunteers,' which divided from the National Volunteers when Mr John Redmond and his supporters took the side of the Allies in the Great War.

From 1916 to 1922 the I.R.A. was under the influence of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, a secret society which was founded in the United States of America in 1858. The Republican Brotherhood helped to organise the Fenian Rising in the last century and it worked in close collaboration with the American *Clan-na-Gael*, which sent emissaries to England to commit a series of dynamite outrages in 1882-3. The modern I.R.A. resembles the I.R.B. in many ways, in particular as a society plotting the overthrow of constitutional authority. The I.R.B. was at one time in touch with Karl Marx's International. The I.R.A. some years ago was working in association with the Communist movement in Ireland,

but several of its members were opposed to Communism and the militant republican movement in Ireland divided into the I.R.A. and the Republican Congress, the latter, the Communist body, having since disappeared from the scene.

During the Great War the Irish Republicans declared that Germany was an ally. Germany sent a cargo of arms for the rebellion of 1916, but the ship, the 'Aud,' was captured by the British Naval forces at Queenstown. In recent months Nazi propaganda has been sent from Germany to I.R.A. leaders in various parts of Ireland, but there has been no evidence of a close association, though it has been stated many times that 'England's enemy must be Ireland's friend,' and in the House of Commons in July last Sir Samuel Hoare said that the I.R.A. bombing outrages were being closely watched and actively stimulated by foreign organisation. The majority of I.R.A. members and other republicans in Ireland have always been regarded as strongly anti-Fascist in their sympathies.

The headquarters of the I.R.A. are wherever circumstances have compelled the leaders of the organisation to be. Usually, however, Dublin is the centre from which instructions are issued. At present the leaders are walking freely about the streets of Dublin, familiar figures to the police and known to hundreds of citizens. There are 'divisions,' 'brigades' and 'battalions' of the organisation scattered throughout Ireland and in parts of England and Scotland that have working-class populations. In Roman Catholic country districts of Northern Ireland the I.R.A. has imposed a system of virtual conscription.

The strength of the I.R.A. is a secret known only to its leaders and probably their estimates are only approximate. Like any other civilian society, its membership and distribution fluctuate as adherents move about the country in search of work. It has been claimed that the I.R.A. now is more numerous than at the time of the conflict between the Crown Forces and Sinn Féin, before the establishment of the Irish Free State, and in those years it numbered about 15,000, although there were never more than 5000 men on what was described as active service.

In Dublin the I.R.A. includes a very large number of unemployed and unemployable youths. There is a steady recruitment from the republican 'boy scout' movement founded by the Countess Markievicz, so that young men predominate in the rank and file of the organisation. Since 1916 this 'scout' movement, *Fianna na h-Eireann*, has served as a catchment area for all the extremist organisations in Ireland. Governments may change, but they don't change fast enough to attain the heights of republicanism preached to the youth of *Fianna na h-Eireann*. As the boys who have entered the I.R.A. at fifteen or sixteen years of age grow older, marry, or secure employment they drift into legitimate political organisations, but their strong views are seldom tempered by age. The aims of the Irish Republican Army and of Mr de Valera's *Fianna Fail* party are absolutely similar. With the accumulation of years, however, Mr de Valera and his present followers realised that unconstitutional methods in politics were profitable neither to individuals nor to their party. The Irish Republican Army, on the other hand, has no time for parliaments and their delays. It regards a bullet as an argument ten times more effective than a thousand ballot papers and does not admit the right of majorities to decide the political aims of the country.

All the I.R.A. men in Dublin are not unemployed youths. There is a sprinkling of university students, working men, and clerks in the movement, while the leaders include even representatives of the professions. A guide to the mentality of the members is provided by one of their typical activities, the snatching of Earl Haig poppies from the breasts of women and isolated men on Remembrance Day. In the country the members of the I.R.A. are principally sons of small farmers and farm labourers, and in country districts there is greater scope than in the city for terrorist activities. In recent years I.R.A. bands in the country have taken sides in agrarian disputes, burned houses occasionally, and so cowed the ordinary law-abiding people that the edict of the I.R.A. is observed as carefully in some places as the legislative measures of *Dail Eireann*. Even in the *Dail*, or parliament, members of the Government party, apart from ministers—who have armed police guards

on their homes and following their high-powered American motor cars—have not dared to criticise the I.R.A.

There has been nothing very courageous about the activities of the I.R.A. in Ireland at any time. Its members never attack a victim who has any possible chance of striking back. After their murder of Vice-Admiral Somerville, a man of 72 years of age, at Castle-townsend, Co. Cork, in March 1936, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Ross declared that the crime 'bore every mark of the coward who will strike only when assured of impunity.' At the same time, several members of the organisation fought with the International Brigade on what was the Government side in Spain, and notwithstanding the reticence of the Irish newspapers in speaking of these Spanish fighters, the impression in Ireland, even among those with no republican sympathies, is that they fought bravely. Frank Ryan, who still is held prisoner by General Franco's forces, was an I.R.A. leader and he is said to have been one of the best and most daring officers of the International Brigade. But it was not the youths of the I.R.A. who went to Spain; it was men whose democratic ideas were maturing.

The activities of the I.R.A. have been condemned by the Church and membership of the organisation has been declared to be a sin. The I.R.B. and the Fenians also were under the ban of the Church. But, powerful as the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland unquestionably is, it never has been able to prevent the rise and development of revolutionary societies. Its bans are defied and its denunciations ignored. Indeed, in orthodox politics the Church in Ireland is more often on the losing than the winning side. It fought the Parnellites with fierce energy in the early 'nineties' of the last century, yet John Redmond remained at Westminster and triumphed over the anti-Parnellites. It was wholeheartedly on the side of Mr Cosgrave's *Cumann na nGaedhael* party in the election in which Mr de Valera and *Fianna Fail* first were returned to power.

The object of the I.R.A. is to obtain a republic for the whole of Ireland. That was the object of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the Irish Volunteers, and the Citizen Army in the rebellion of Easter Week, 1916; it was the object of Mr de Valera and the anti-Treaty



forces in 1922. The aim has been confused with its attainment by the pretence that has been kept up by succeeding republican parties that the Irish Republic actually does exist and that the various parliaments and governments that have held seats and office since 1922 have been illegal. In the autumn of 1922, when the Free State government was operating under Mr Cosgrave, the irregular forces opposing the army called upon Mr de Valera to 'reconstitute the government (of the Republic) and form a Council of State.' Mr de Valera's supporters met in Dublin and elected him President of the Republic; at the same time the leaders of the irregular army issued a proclamation that they, 'on behalf of the soldiers of the Republic, acting in the spirit of our oath as the final custodians of the Republic, and interpreting the desire of all true citizens of the Republic, have called upon the former president, Eamon de Valera, and the faithful members of *Dail Eireann* to form a government, which they have done.' That, and not the proclamation of 1916, was the origin of the shadow republic which survives to-day in the minds and declarations of the body calling itself the Irish Republican Army—still the 'final custodians of the Republic' and 'interpreting the desire of all true citizens,' no doubt, in the bombing outrages which have taken place in England.

Apart from the considerable economic and international inconvenience which would result from it, there is no reason why the Dublin parliament should not declare a republic to-morrow. The majority of the people of Eire, however, seem to realise that having a republican aim and having a republic are two different things. At the *Ard-Fheis*, or annual convention, of his party last November Mr de Valera pointed out that there was no legal objection to their declaring a republic for the twenty-six counties, but their immediate aim, he stated, should be to get their constitution extended to thirty-two counties, and, when that was done, those who wished could call the State a republic. He went on to make one of the many attacks which have been made on Britain in the last eighteen months on the ground that her subsidies and her troops make possible the continuance of the Northern Ireland State. The bombing outrages in England, said Senator Frank MacDermot, when the

Dublin Senate discussed them in July last, were largely the result of the calamitous anti-partition campaign that the Government had started and of the proceeding of the Anti-Partition League.

It is necessary to recount these things to make the campaign of the I.R.A. in England understandable. Those who object to what is called the partition of Ireland used to direct their fury against the Northern Ireland government and the Ulster Unionist party, but that only increased the breach between the two States. Then the fashion changed and it was England that was attacked. The 'new plan' for Northern Ireland was to permit it to exist as a State if it separated itself from Britain and took its spiritual and cultural inspiration from Dublin instead of London. Northern Ireland's great fault was that it was British and Britain could remedy that, it was argued, by removing the economic link and the military link. If Northern Ireland were isolated from Britain, the south would possess the economic and military power to convince Northern Ireland that unity with the south would be a very good thing. No one was more impressed with this argument than the I.R.A. If speeches could not remove British influence from Northern Ireland, then bombs might.

Anyway, it was necessary that the I.R.A. should start something big. Its strength was growing; some justification had to be found for its existence, some outlet for the enthusiasm of its members. Its Northern Ireland divisions and brigades had become impatient at the failure of constitutional methods to secure the unity of north and south; its Dublin units were growing tired of marching to cemeteries to hear graveside orations. The revolvers of the younger members were going off in places where they should not and members of the I.R.A. were being accidentally killed under I.R.A. auspices, more or less.

The last spectacular effort attributed to the I.R.A. had been the murder of Kevin O'Higgins, the Free State Minister for Justice, in July 1927. He had been a relentless opponent of the republicans in the civil war that followed the division over the Articles for a Treaty in 1922.

When the civil war came to an end in 1923 Mr de

Valera in a message to the Irish Republican Army said : 'The Republic can no longer be defended successfully by your arms. . . . Other means must be sought to safeguard the nation's right.' The various units of the I.R.A. concealed their arms and demobilised themselves. In the course of time the majority of republicans became the *Fianna Fail* party. At first their elected representatives refused to enter *Dail Eireann* because of the oath of allegiance, but eventually Mr de Valera decided that the oath was 'an empty formula,' the *Fianna Fail* deputies took their seats, and in course of time Mr de Valera's party became the Government of the State. Before that happened the more extreme republicans, soon after the chastening effects of the civil war had passed, had reaffirmed their faith in the existence of the republic, elected a president of that shadow and set about a resumption of militant activities. The I.R.A. came to life again, its nucleus the irreconcilables who refused to work for a republic by constitutional means and the children supplied by *Fianna na h-Eireann*. The new, the third, I.R.A., at no time operated as an army. Its weapon was terrorism.

In 1924 the Free State government, in order to deal with the I.R.A., passed a Public Safety Act which gave power to imprison without trial. Towards the end of the year it ceased to operate the Act and there was a general release of republican prisoners. Some of these followed Mr de Valera into the paths of constitutionalism, but there was a section which was wedded to militant politics. With the passing of years this section became so strong that there were fears in 1931 that an attempt would be made by it to overthrow the government by force of arms. In the summer of that year a Civic Guard (police) superintendent and a private citizen had been murdered in County Tipperary. There was terrorism in the south ; few arrests were being made for political crimes and where they were the jurymen were being intimidated. The Government decided to suppress the I.R.A. Military courts were set up to try gunmen and conspirators. Soon the I.R.A. had been driven underground.

When Mr de Valera became President of the Executive Council in 1932 he released the political prisoners and the

I.R.A. entered on a new lease of life. Mr Brian O'Higgins, president of Sinn Féin, in a speech at Limerick urged the 'soldiers of the Republic' to continue on 'the straight, hard road, in the fight for freedom, to follow the examples of the comrades who never compromised, who died rather than accept the status of British citizens.'

The I.R.A. still regarded the Free State parliament as an illegal body, but in January 1933 it issued a manifesto releasing the organisation from the restriction that prevented it from taking part in elections. At the election then pending it advised its members to vote against Mr Cosgrave's party and to support *Fianna Fail*. While adopting that course, however, the manifesto explained that 'we do not commit ourselves in any way to acceptance of the policy of *Fianna Fail*.' Two months later the I.R.A. appeared in military formation, five battalions marching in a commemorative parade to Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, while throughout the country members of the organisation, rejoicing in Mr de Valera's removal of the ban on them, made an impressive display of military strength.

'The republic is the goal for which we strive and we shall not rest till we reach it,' said Mr de Valera in April 1933 at an Easter Week celebration of the 1916 rebellion. And in August he re-established the military tribunal to try political prisoners. This time, however, the tribunal was not set up to try republicans. The economic war with England had started, farmers were bearing the brunt of it, General O'Duffy had started his Blue Shirt organisation and there was a steadily developing Fascist movement in the country. There was a stream of Blue Shirts past the military tribunal, for that movement was declared illegal. As a consequence the I.R.A. became illegal too, and in course of time its members also made appearances before the tribunal. But the Government exceeded its powers. The High Court ordered the release of a Blue Shirt captain who had been sentenced by the tribunal, and in July 1934 the Government released all political prisoners, including twenty-one republicans.

In the meantime the I.R.A. had conducted a boycott of a certain English brew of beer. Stocks of the beer were destroyed by armed men and walls in town and country bore signs advocating the boycott. The un-

expected result was that thousands of people drank nothing but the beer concerned. 'A bottle of boycott' became a popular order in public houses.

In February 1935 the I.R.A. murdered Mr Richard More O'Ferrall. Four gunmen entered his father's house at Lisard, near Edgeworthstown, where a land dispute was in progress. They tried to pull the elder Mr O'Ferrall from the table where he was dining with some guests and when they struck him on the head with revolvers Mr Richard O'Ferrall rushed to his assistance. He was knocked down and shot as he lay on the ground. After his death the words 'Spies beware' were painted on the walls of the nearest courthouse, at Longford. A series of raids on Dublin republicans took place in the following month, forty arrests being made. Four men were charged with the crime at Edgeworthstown and acquitted.

Once again, in 1936, the I.R.A. was declared illegal and the organisation replied by turning itself into a political party, the *Cumann na Poblachia*, of which very little since has been heard. About this time the I.R.A. was displaying inconsistencies in its attitude to constitutional assemblies. It ran candidates at an election in Northern Ireland and Mr Frank Ryan stood in a Free State election, obtaining very few votes.

The last important operation by the I.R.A. in the south of Ireland was the murder of Admiral Somerville in March 1936 and of a man named John Egan in April of the same year. Admiral Somerville was alleged to have helped young men who came to him for advice about joining the Royal Navy. In the eyes of the I.R.A. that was a crime, and although he was a man of 72 years of age Admiral Somerville was shot dead. Egan had been an I.R.A. man and his murder was believed to be linked up with that of the Admiral. He was shot down in the streets of Dungarvan one Sunday night by men who had travelled some distance in a motor car. For this murder Michael Conway was sentenced to death by the military tribunal, but Mr de Valera released him with other political prisoners in 1938.

Amnesties for political prisoners are so common that no I.R.A. member sentenced in Eire expects to remain in jail long. It is not unlikely that the terrorists who have

been operating in England have complete confidence in an amnesty being declared for their benefit, so that they have not had the same fear of punishment as would be the case if they thought they really would have to serve the terms of imprisonment to which they have been sentenced. Already bodies in Ireland are in full cry for such an amnesty. A Roman Catholic priest, the Rev. T. Maguire, at a meeting near Newtownbutler, Co. Fermanagh, on Aug. 20 last, described the 'monstrous sentences imposed upon Irishmen and women in England' as 'nothing but legal reprisals.' 'Are we going to forget the sacrifices and sufferings of these brothers of ours?' he asked his audience. 'Are we to remain silent while they suffer for us?' The bombings, he said, had aroused them to a keen sense of their duty to the nation. The bombings had given them no set-back, but a real push forward, if they were not slaves and hypocrites. This clergyman was one of the speakers at the *Ard-Fheis* of Mr de Valera's *Fianna Fail* party last November.

In Northern Ireland the I.R.A. meets with stronger opposition than in the south, and for that reason its operations in Ulster have been of a different type from those in the south. Its agents have provoked political and religious riots, in Belfast especially. In August 1937, when the King and Queen visited Belfast, the I.R.A. destroyed all the customs huts along the Northern Ireland-Free State border, blew up portion of a bridge on the railway line on which people from the Free State were travelling to Belfast to see their Majesties, and attempted to wreck a train in which special constables who had been guarding the King and Queen were returning from Belfast to Londonderry. They also blew up portion of a house in Belfast during the visit of the King and Queen.

With the appointment of Sean Russell as chief of the Irish Republican Army bombing was substituted for shooting as the principal activity of the organisation. Russell is skilled in the manufacture of land mines and bombs of all types. He has been a revolutionary for over twenty-three years and has been identified with the I.R.A. since the days of its conflict with the Crown Forces. In 1921 he was its Director of Munitions, a position which he occupied with the irregular forces in



the Civil War. Over a year ago he led a party of gunmen who were extreme even among extremists and they took control of the I.R.A. virtually at the point of their revolvers. Preparations for the 'war' on England then commenced.

The series of outrages began in December last when the Irish customs huts again were destroyed, this time by bombs which had been placed in suit-cases that were handed to 'bus conductors with instructions that they were to be left at customs huts 'to be called for.' While one of the suit-cases was being prepared at Castlefin, near the Donegal-Tyrone border, the bomb exploded and three men were killed. They were members of the I.R.A. and one of them had been identified by a witness at the trial following the Edgeworthstown murder as the man who shot Mr Richard O'Ferrall. The Northern Government already was aware that the I.R.A. had planned attacks upon prominent citizens of the State and it at once made a swoop, arresting thirty-four leaders of the movement in Belfast. Information about the coming campaign in England was discovered and the British police were warned.

An extraordinary reaction followed. The Provincial Anti-Partition Council of Northern Ireland, the Limerick Board of Health, and other bodies condemned not the bombings but the arrests. The Labour leader in *Dail Eireann*, Mr William Norton, asked Mr de Valera if he proposed to take any steps to protest against 'the wholesale arrest and imprisonment without trial of Irish citizens resident in the Six Counties.' The Roman Catholic Bishop of Down in his Lenten Pastoral declared that 'men are arrested, thrown into prison and detained there without any charge brought against them. . . . At all hours of the night our Catholic homes are entered and searched by uniformed men.' In view of what was to occur in England soon afterwards the views then expressed by the Rev. Mr Maguire, parish priest of Newtownbutler, are of interest. He claimed that a secret gang in Belfast were forging documents and terrorist lists as emanating from the I.R.A. 'and having them planted in the proper quarter.' He alleged that this secret gang had agents in England and that these agents had been active in recent explosions.

In Northern Ireland the Irish Republican Army always has been an illegal organisation. In order to deal with it the Northern Government has been forced to keep in operation its Civil Authorities (Special Powers) Act, a measure which entitles it to intern the members of illegal organisations. There were measures in the Free State with points of similarity in the Public Safety Act and the amendment of the Constitution which permitted the trial of I.R.A. members by military courts, while even stronger points of similarity with the Northern Government's Act are to be found in the Treason and Offences Against the State Acts passed a few months ago by the Eireann Government. It is wrong to assume, however, that citizens of Northern Ireland can be interned without inquiry into their alleged connection with the Irish Republican Army, for a tribunal has been set up to hear representations for the release of internees. Two of the thirty-four men arrested by the Northern Government in December took advantage of this right of appeal.

On the day that the campaign of bombings commenced in England the Northern Ireland Ministry of Home Affairs issued a statement claiming vindication for its action in interning the I.R.A. leaders, if any were necessary, in the proclamation which the republicans had issued calling for the assistance of all Irishmen 'in the effort about to be made to compel the evacuation of the armed forces, civilian officials, institutions and representatives of England in Northern Ireland and to enthrone the Republic of Ireland.'

When their plans for the campaign in England were revealed through the capture of papers by the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the Irish Republican Army took immediate action. Already the 'government' of the shadow republic had granted a military dictatorship to the I.R.A., this decision being announced in a republican newspaper known as the 'Wolfe Tone Weekly.' A proclamation was circulated in Ireland calling for support of the I.R.A. and Patrick Fleming, a mental hospital attendant on apparently limitless sick leave, on behalf of the 'government' and the Army Council of the I.R.A., addressed an ultimatum to Lord Halifax demanding the withdrawal of all British armed forces stationed in Ireland.

'The government of the Irish Republic,' he wrote, 'believes that a period of four days is sufficient notice for your government to signify its intentions in the matter of the military evacuation and for the issue of your declaration of abdication in respect of our country. Our country reserves the right of appropriate action without further notice if, upon the expiration of this period of grace, these conditions remain unfulfilled.'

It had been known in Ireland that the I.R.A. had been preparing for some big activity, but its proclamation was not taken seriously by the newspapers or the ordinary citizens.

The ultimatum addressed to Viscount Halifax expired on Jan. 16 and on that date the bomb outrages commenced in England, attempts to wreck electric supply services being made in London, Manchester, Birmingham, and Alnwick. Carrying the 'war' into England was not a new feature of Irish revolutionary campaigns. It had been done during the Fenian Rising of the last century and in March 1921 the I.R.A. of that period started big fires in Newcastle, South Shields, and Hyde, and forty smaller fires in Cheshire, while in April of the same year there were burnings in Manchester and a window-smashing campaign in London. The murder of Sir Henry Wilson in London in June 1922, was not the work of the irregular forces which had then taken the title of Irish Republican Army, but of the Irish Republican Brotherhood, the organisation which had created the I.R.A., and which, remarkably, had become pro-Treaty in the split which occurred in the Free State ranks. The murder actually was arranged by Michael Collins, then at the head of the Free State army.

As a result of the information passed to them by the Royal Ulster Constabulary, the police in Great Britain were able to seize stocks of explosives and documents as soon as the bombing campaign started. One instruction to I.R.A. members in England stated that 'diversion' must be carried out at a time when no major war or world crisis was on. 'But if it is carried out when trouble is anticipated, with jumpiness and nervous expectation of the Government as well as the nervous potential panic of the people, it can be exploited to the full.' The action recommended included the sabotaging of aeroplane and munition factories, the public services, accessible

key industries, commerce, banking, shipping and ordinary industries and the English press. The use of delayed action land mines was suggested. A document on moral sabotage suggested the desirability of members of the I.R.A. joining A.R.P. units to give them an insight into the precautions being taken and to make them 'respectable in the eyes of their neighbours,' as well as serving as a cloak for their activities.

In preparation for the campaign great stocks of explosives had been assembled in virtually every big English city. By the end of six months the police had captured 1,500 sticks of gelignite, 1,000 detonators, two tons of potassium chlorate and oxide of iron, seven gallons of sulphuric acid, and four cwt. of aluminium powder. Suitable disguises for I.R.A. men had been arranged. In one police raid a detective found a Royal Air Force uniform, a postman's uniform, as well as stocks of stationery bearing the Royal Arms and envelopes marked 'O.H.M.S.' Leading members of the organisation left Dublin to arrange explosions in England, returning to their employment in Ireland when the series of explosions for which they had accepted responsibility had been carried out.

From the beginning of February to the end of July outrages were of daily occurrence. They followed the lines of the instructions discovered by the police in the first days of the campaign. Damage was caused at railway stations by bombs left in cloakrooms, fires were started in Birmingham, Liverpool, Coventry and other cities and towns, attempts were made to wreck public service undertakings and there was interference with the mails. Declarations frequently were made that there would be no attempt to take the life of any British subject in the course of the campaign, but in July the British Government discovered that the I.R.A. had decided to pursue a more ruthless policy which was to take no account of human life and which included the blowing up of the Houses of Parliament at Westminster. Two days after the Home Secretary, Sir Samuel Hoare, had told Parliament of the existence of this plan his words were confirmed by explosions at King's Cross and Victoria stations, causing the death of one person and injuries to twenty others. In the meantime the Government had

introduced the Prevention of Violence (Temporary Provisions) Bill, giving power to deport suspected terrorists and to prohibit them from entering Great Britain.

This measure passed quickly through parliament and since its becoming law deportations of I.R.A. suspects have been daily occurrences. Outrages have almost ceased. Many leaders of the I.R.A. in England have gone to Ireland without waiting to be deported and the plan of campaign has been seriously disorganised. It would be optimistic, however, to think that it has been abandoned. The deportees have a headquarters in Dublin and they have many sympathisers in Ireland who will encourage them to make further efforts. The breaking up of the conspiracy and the submergence of the I.R.A. now depends upon action by the Eireann government.

In Eire there had been two principal shades of reaction to the bombings—of approval and disapproval. There were some who went so far as to denounce the bombers. The 'Irish Times' was sure that 'all decent Irishmen' were horrified, but when a number of republican organisations held a commemoration parade to Glasnevin Cemetery on April 9, Mr Brian O'Higgins said they sent a message of praise and congratulation to their 'faithful comrades who were fighting Ireland's battle in British prisons and outside them,' telling them they were proud of them as they ever had been proud of republican soldiers. At this and other parades on the same day references were made to the 'expeditionary force' in England and to the Irish Republic's having recognised the separate nationality of Scotland and Wales. In February, when Mr de Valera introduced his Treason Bill in *Dail Eireann*, the Labour leader, Mr Norton, said they should hold their hand when, in another country, an effort was being made to flame up indignation against Irishmen arraigned on certain charges there. Protests against the severity of the sentences imposed in the bomb explosion trials were passed and sympathy with the bombers expressed at meetings in many parts of the country. Public expressions of horror were confined to the leading article in the 'Irish Times' and the speeches in the Senate of a few fearless men like Frank MacDermot and Desmond Fitzgerald.

The disapproval of the Government and of the principal opposition party in *Dail Eireann*, Mr Cosgrave's *Fine Gael*, is sincere. It is generally believed, however, that many of Mr de Valera's followers would prefer to see him co-operating with the I.R.A. It is doubtful if the Prime Minister has given expression to his real feelings about the I.R.A. He probably regards it as a confounded nuisance and if it and its works could be wiped off the face of the earth in the morning he would, no doubt, consider that miracle a distinct blessing. His statements have been carefully phrased, constituting a protest against any body claiming to be the government of Ireland or the military force of Ireland when it is not so, and his denunciation of the I.R.A.'s activity in England has taken the line that that activity is wrong because it has set back the Government's anti-partition campaign. He declared in the Senate on July 26 that the Government had no sympathy with the campaign, but in expressing his belief that the method and way of the I.R.A. was wrong he added, 'I do believe that a number of them is honestly animated by a desire to secure Irish liberty.' He knows that the I.R.A. has been endeavouring to secure by force what he has been endeavouring to secure, at one time by unconstitutional and now by constitutional means. He knows that the spirit of hatred of England, fostered for over one hundred years in the south of Ireland, persists and that there is general appreciation of any effective method of demonstrating that hatred, whether it be constitutional or unconstitutional. He has to choose his words.

However, it does not follow that because he speaks in guarded phrases that Mr de Valera will not play his part in preventing a continuance of I.R.A. activity in England. On June 23 his Government once again declared the Irish Republican Army to be an illegal body in Eire and prevented it from holding a parade at the grave of Wolfe Tone, the 1798 rebel, at Bodenstown, Co. Kildare. Early in August a number of men were arrested on charges of being in possession of explosives or seditious documents, but those cases are *sub judice* at the time of writing. On Aug. 22 the Government brought into operation the parts of the Offences Against the State Act which provide for the setting up of special



criminal courts being 'satisfied that the ordinary courts are inadequate to secure the effective administration of justice and the preservation of public peace and order,' and give power of arrest, detention, and internment whenever a Minister of State is satisfied that any particular person is engaged in activities calculated to prejudice the preservation of the peace or security of the State.

O'Y.

# Art. 9.—ARMS AND THE EMPIRE OVERSEAS.

APPROXIMATELY eight million British subjects took part in the Great War, and no less than one-third of these came from the Dominions, India, and the Colonies. Indeed, the overseas Empire made a formidable contribution to the fighting strength of the Allies, a contribution that was formidable in quality as well as quantity ; and therefore it is curious that the potentialities of the overseas Empire have not received more attention meanwhile. A brief consideration of the defence preparations that have recently been made in the Dominions and Colonies may accordingly be presented, not only to show that the overseas Empire is far better prepared for war to-day than it was in 1914, but also to demonstrate that it has immeasurably greater military possibilities.

But first, as a basis for comparison, it may be useful to survey briefly the part played by the overseas Empire in the Great War. Consider the position of Canada in 1914. She had a Permanent Force of exactly 3000, with no system of reserves ; while the Active Militia, with a nominal strength of about 75,000, was ' not taken seriously by the country at large, and hardly even by itself. . . . In 1913 the Inspector-General noted the distressing fact that 25 per cent. of the officers were absent from training and half of this number without leave. Equipment, staff, training-grounds were all inadequate.' \* But within two months of the declaration of war a flotilla of 32 vessels had left for England with a first contingent of 30,000 eager young Canadians, and the total enlistments in Canada during the War amounted to nearly 600,000 men, of whom 418,000 went overseas, about 51,000 were killed, and nearly 150,000 were wounded. Who shall forget Alderson's, Byng's, and Currie's men at Ypres, the Somme, Vimy, Passchendaele, Amiens, and the final Hindenburg Line ?

Similarly the trained land forces of Australia in 1914 comprised only some 2500 permanent and 46,000 citizen or territorial soldiers. But on Aug. 3, 1914, the day before war was declared, the Australian Cabinet made

---

\* Professor F. H. Underhill in 'The Empire at War,' vol. ii (Oxford, 1923).

an immediate offer of an expeditionary force, and was enthusiastically applauded by a nation determined, in its own words, to fight to 'the last man and the last shilling.' Australians formed the backbone of the Gallipoli offensive, and they defeated the enemy in every hand-to-hand engagement. Later they turned the tide of the Somme, and were uniformly successful in their attacks at Messines, Ypres, and the Outpost Line. With Allenby they took 50,000 prisoners in Palestine for their own loss of less than one hundred. Approximately 416,809 Australians enlisted in the War, and nearly 332,000 crossed the seas. Over 59,000 lost their lives. But no fewer than 318,000 casualties were suffered, the highest percentage to enlistments in the Empire. Little can be added to that, except that Australia also made a financial contribution of over 300,000,000*l.* to the cost of winning that war.

New Zealand is the smallest of the Dominions, but she equalled the others in her zeal if not in physical magnitude of effort. In 1914 she had a permanent force of only 578 and a territorial force of only 25,902. But she offered an expeditionary corps at once, and 117,175 New Zealanders served overseas, approximately 10 per cent. of the total population, to earn Earl Haig's famous eulogy: 'No Division in France built up for itself a finer reputation, whether for the gallantry of its conduct in battle or for the excellence of its behaviour out of the line.' \*

South Africa, which had recently emerged from an internal ordeal, not only took the brunt of the colonial campaigns and sternly suppressed rebellion at home, but also sent over 136,000 troops to the various fronts, some 20 per cent. of the total white male population, whose deeds at the Somme, Arras, Ypres 1917, Cambrai, and 1918 battles are sufficiently memorable. Then India contributed her 242,607 British and 1,096,013 Indian troops; while space only forbids mention of the Irish effort, of the vast supplies of raw materials and foodstuffs sent to Europe from all parts of the Empire, and of the innumerable small but valuable drafts from the many Crown Colonies and Protectorates.

---

\* Dr A. J. Harrop in 'My New Zealand' (Jarrolds, 1939).

Indeed, the remarkable efforts of the overseas Empire during the Great War made the world realise that here was a new fighting force with which to reckon. Lulled into a sense of false security by the result of the conflict, however, and following the example of Great Britain, the Dominions and Colonies afterwards allowed their fine military machines to be dismantled. But in turn this sanguine mood was thrust aside by successive waves of disillusionment, caused by the activities of aggressor nations, the repeated failure of the League of Nations to restrain those aggressors, and, finally, the decision of Great Britain herself to abandon the Genevan policy and proceed with intensive re-armament. The aggressor nations began to talk loudly of undeveloped overseas lands and of stolen colonies. So the British Dominions and Colonies sighed wearily and began again to consider their supplies of arms and munitions. In each case they initiated large-scale defence plans, which were immediately accelerated after the unfortunate crises of September 1938 and this uncomfortable year. It may therefore be best to deal with the reactions to the needs of re-armament of every Dominion in turn.

Since Canada is the senior Dominion, her re-armament programme shall come first, although it is not the most ambitious, nor are full details of the latest developments yet available. But the Canadian Government decided recently that 'the uncertainties of the future and the conditions of modern warfare make it imperative that Canada's defences should be materially strengthened'; and it was announced from Ottawa on Jan. 26, 1939, that about 13,000,000*l.* would be available for defence purposes during the year, compared with only 8,000,000*l.* in 1938. Almost half of this sum was to be spent on the Royal Canadian Air Force. Eighty-three new aeroplanes were to be acquired and the personnel increased, so that Canada will soon possess an Air Force of some 3500 men with about 400 modern machines. About 1,500,000*l.* has been allotted for the training of pilots; and training and bombing machines are being manufactured in the Dominion itself not only for local needs but also for the special requirements of Great Britain.

Coastal bases have been established on the Pacific and along the Labrador coasts, and an air station has

been set up on the Island of Anticosti in connection with the defences of the St Lawrence. According to Press reports, it is the intention ultimately to have 23 Air Force units with a total of 520 machines, service and training. It is worth remembering that there 'wasn't any sich thing' as a Canadian Air Force in 1914 and that only a year ago Canadian strategists were agreed that the most to be expected in war was 'minor attacks by combined sea, land, and air forces, to destroy something of strategic or commercial value, or to secure an advanced base of operations.' \* It was considered then that a skeleton force of defenders would be sufficient to repulse such attacks. Mr Mackenzie King said in the Canadian House of Commons in May, 1938: 'At present the danger of attack upon Canada is minor in degree and second-hand in origin. It is against chance shots that we need immediately to defend ourselves.' But the events of September 1938, together with demonstrations elsewhere of the growth of air power, soon produced a changed outlook, put into words by the Canadian Defence Minister when he stated last January 'that invulnerability from overseas attack has now been dissipated by modern invention.' †

This year's vote for the Canadian land forces is about 4,000,000L., an increase of nearly 1,000,000L. on the 1938 Estimates. The strength of the Permanent Active Militia was formerly 4,000 and the Non-Permanent Active Militia about 45,000. Drastic reorganisation of these forces is proceeding, however, and strong permanent defences have been established at vital places. Anti-aircraft units have been formed and it is certainly true that the strength of the Canadian military has been doubled in the last three years. There were 109 rifle battalions in 1936, compared with 220 recently, and 90 machine-gun battalions compared with 220. Three years ago there were no tank battalions; now there are 84. Similar increases are shown in the cavalry, artillery and signal units.

The total Naval Vote for the year is about 1,700,000L., providing for an increase in the personnel from 1621 to nearly 2000, the purchase of a flotilla leader from Britain,

\* The Hon. Ian Mackenzie, Minister of Defence, Canadian House of Commons Debates (unrevised), March 24, 1938.

† The same, in 'Canada's Weekly,' Jan. 20, 1939.

and the establishment of naval reserves. The naval complement comprises six destroyers and some smaller vessels, but it is understood that the Government intends ultimately to provide a total of 18 destroyers, 9 for each seaboard. But perhaps the most important feature of Canadian re-armament is in the provision for supply. As this involves the manufacture of aircraft, the question is dealt with elsewhere, but considerable progress has also been made with the manufacture of light machine-guns, anti-aircraft equipment, and some heavy armaments. Britain's armament factories might be bombed to a standstill, but Canadian supplies would be available to fill the gap. This might be a factor of decisive importance.

The same applies to Australia's recent effort to improve her defences. Last December it was decided to spend approximately 60,000,000*l.* in the next three years on re-armament. Special expenditure on munitions factories will make this Dominion second only to Britain among the countries of the Empire in the possession of facilities for the manufacture of war materials. It is believed that certain of the new factories, such as those devoted to the manufacture of military aircraft, the Bren gun and munitions, will eventually become not only the main source of supply to Australia, but also the principal supply reserve of New Zealand, South Africa, and the British forces in the East. This development is extremely important, although it does not by any means represent the only weapon of the stronger Australia. As a result of prodigious efforts in the last few years that continent now has a permanent defence organisation providing for a field army of seven divisions. The Militia, equivalent to the Territorials, has an establishment of 70,000, and a reserve of 50,000 trained men is being built up, so that she has been able to make an initial call on 120,000 men.

The Australian Air Force will eventually be the strongest overseas air weapon in the Empire. Its first-line strength to-day is of over 200 of the latest machines, with approximately 3000 trained men. An Air Reserve was recently established. The Royal Australian Navy comprises five modern cruisers, seven destroyers, many smaller craft, and a personnel of about 6000. Naval plans include modernisation of ships, an ambitious



coastal defence organisation, the construction of a battleship dock at Sydney, and a scheme to make Darwin in the Northern Territory a strongly fortified base to collaborate with Singapore.

South Africa similarly is making a big feature of naval preparedness, and at present is laying down fortifications at Capetown which, it is claimed, will make this port a 'Heligoland of the south.' The Defence Minister has declared that 137,000 troops and 1000 pilots could be mobilised at a moment's notice, while conscription would bring a further 150,000 men under arms. Thousands of natives would be available for labour service. To finance re-armament it was decided in 1938 to allocate 6,000,000*l.* in the next three years, but recently this sum was increased to meet special contingencies. Most of the necessary arms and equipment is being bought through the British War Office, but a certain proportion is being manufactured in the Union. An ammunition factory with a large output-capacity has been established at Pretoria. All raw materials required, with the exception of aluminium, are obtainable from local sources.

The Three Years' Plan as it affects the Union's Air Force provides for a final total of some 2000 pilots and some 500 to 600 interceptor fighters and bombing planes. At present the policy is to buy so-called obsolescent warplanes from Britain, on the understanding that in the event of war the necessary first-line machines would be supplied from accumulated reserves. The considered view of the South African General Staff is that, under present conditions, the Union would hardly be liable to attack from the sea otherwise than by way of an isolated raid; but there is 'more than a possibility that we shall, within our generation, be called upon to defend ourselves against an enemy on or beyond our northern borders, that is to say, in bush country.'\* The Union, therefore, has recently helped the administration of South-West Africa to put its defences in order by supplying aircraft and personnel, and by helping to re-organise the police.

---

\* Mr O. Pirow, South African Minister of Defence, in 'Union of South Africa, House of Assembly Debates,' vol. 32, 1938.

New Zealand has always lagged behind the other Dominions in defensive preparations, and during the last few years has been controlled by a Labour Government with strong pacifist sympathies. But a drastic scheme for the re-organisation of the defence forces has already been initiated by that Government, bringing the three Services under centralised control. Coastal defences have been strengthened; and 30 Vickers-Wellington bombers, with 29 obsolete Buffin and 5 Airspeed Oxford machines, have been purchased from the British Air Ministry. It has been estimated by the Minister of Defence that New Zealand could train at least 1000 pilots a year. The New Zealand spirit was demonstrated recently when 2000 applications were received in less than a fortnight for twelve short-term service commissions in the Royal Air Force. Military aircraft are shortly to be manufactured in this Dominion also. The land forces have recently been raised from 10,000 to 16,000, as the nucleus of a large citizen army. In spite of her size New Zealand could be relied upon to contribute at least 200,000 men to the armed forces of the Empire in war, and probably her initial function would be to join forces with Australia.

This conception of a strategy for Australasia was discussed at a conference on Pacific defence held early in 1939 in New Zealand. Representatives of the United Kingdom, Australia, and New Zealand attended the conference, and they postulated a situation in which the United Kingdom might need all the available strength on the European front and in the Mediterranean. Plans were laid accordingly for a system of defences for the Pacific that, in certain circumstances, would be independent of British reinforcements. Their most important feature was the establishment of a Pacific Defence Council. On the outbreak of war this Council would not only take full control of the agricultural and industrial resources of British territories in the Pacific, but would also direct the activities of all available defence forces, from the armies, navies, and air-forces of the Dominions to the Far Eastern Commands of the Royal Navy and Air Force and the British troops stationed in the Eastern and Pacific colonies. Another outcome of this conference might be the establishment of a Pacific Command of the

Royal Air Force at Fiji. The conference made an exhaustive study of the economic and domestic problems of each Pacific country in the light of a possible emergency. Thus Herr Hitler unconsciously bestowed yet another blessing. Hitherto Australia and New Zealand have been dangerously slow to collaborate with each other. But old prejudices crumble before necessity. Faced by a common danger, Australia and New Zealand dismissed pride and reached an arrangement between themselves which would strengthen their position immensely should war reach the Pacific.

The defence forces of India until recently comprised a standing army of approximately 55,000 British and 160,000 Indian troops, backed by a large reserve. Some eight squadrons of the Royal Air Force (at the time of writing) co-operate with these; and a naval squadron backed by the whole power of the Royal Navy affords protection from sea-borne attack. The land forces are maintained largely at India's expense, although Britain contributes an annual grant of about 2,000,000*l.*, and frequently provides capital equipment.

Plans for re-organisation and strengthening of the defences were announced simultaneously by the British and Indian Governments towards the end of 1938, and an Expert Committee under Lord Chatfield subsequently investigated the military and financial aspects of defence problems on the spot. The findings of this Committee have not been published at the time of writing, but it is generally acknowledged that the British and Indian Governments have already put many of them into operation. The defence of the Frontier has received special attention; while mechanisation, coastal defences, air-raid precautions, and financial questions have also been included in the reforms. Four British battalions have been transferred from the Indian to the Imperial establishments, and the British Government has made a capital grant up to 5,000,000*l.* for the re-equipment of certain British and Indian units. Undoubtedly India will soon be stronger than ever before in her history.

Eire has a Regular Army, a Reserve, and a Volunteer Force. The budgetary effective strength of the Regular Army for 1938-39 was 585 officers, 1454 N.C.Os. and 4346 privates, a total of 6385. The strength of the

Reserve was approximately 6000, and the Volunteer Force about 13,000. In addition to these, one must take into consideration the Military Police, about 200 men, and the Civic Guard, an armed police force of 1243 sergeants and 6000 guards. The Air Corps, according to the only information available at the time of writing, had a total of about 300 all ranks and about 20 machines, only a few of which were capable of use in war as operational units. But Mr de Valera recently announced plans for a strengthening of this force, and stated at the same time that an auxiliary land force would be raised. The final objective is an army of approximately 100,000 men and women. The Defence Estimates for the current year have been increased by 5,500,000*l.* to cover the expense of this expansion, which will include air, land, and coastal mobile military patrols, anti-aircraft and mine-sweeper services. These facts about Eire are given because this country is still technically a part of the British Commonwealth of Nations. Whether Eire will eventually use her army on our side is doubtful.

The greatest activity in the Colonial Empire has taken place in the last year or two among the African colonies, which have been faced with very urgent problems, such as the establishment of Italy on the eastern frontier of the Sudan and the Kenya frontier, the speeding-up of aerial communications, making hitherto isolated territories highly vulnerable, and the agitation of Germany for the return of her former colonies. The Sudan Defence Force is nominally maintained at a strength of 5000, but has already been expanded ; while the King's African Rifles, with a present nominal establishment of some 1600, also in process of expansion, is organised for the protection of Nyasaland, Tanganyika, Kenya, and Somaliland. Both these regiments are commanded by officers and N.C.Os. seconded from the Imperial forces.

It should be noted, however, that an official voluntary register, along the lines of the home scheme, was recently taken in Tanganyika and other colonies. Openings for younger men are offered in the King's African Rifles Reserve of Officers, and the register includes naval volunteers, airmen, ground staffs, medical men, nurses, special constables, and air wardens. The Southern

Brigade of the Rifles has just been re-distributed to secure more adequate protection for Tanganyika. Kenya now has an air unit, and has organised a Women's Emergency Corps, an A.R.P. unit, and an improved intelligence service. Similarly, the Royal West Africa Frontier Force, with its nominal establishment of about 5000, responsible for the defence of Nigeria, the Gold Coast, Sierra Leone and Gambia, has been expanded by the creation of reserves and special units. Meanwhile Northern Rhodesia has announced a five years' defence development plan. The Northern Rhodesian Regiment, previous establishment about 450, is being expanded and re-equipped, while internal air services of strategic importance are being extended. Southern Rhodesia, with still greater responsibilities, also has a big scheme under way. The Southern Rhodesian Defence Force previously had an establishment of about 550 and a Territorial Reserve of about 500. This Colony is now building its own armoured cars.

The defence of Crown Colonies in the Mediterranean and along the route to the East presents many pressing problems in view of recent developments, and it might be worth mentioning that the Gibraltar authorities have not only adopted a comprehensive defence plan, but have compiled a man-power register and conducted tests of the fortifications in collaboration with the Home Fleet. Malta and Cyprus have also had their defences strengthened. Ceylon has doubled her defence vote in the last year, while a Naval Volunteer Reserve has been formed and the Ceylon Defence Force, of which the establishment earlier was about 3300, has been expanded. Malaya recently presented the Imperial Government with more than 1,500,000*l.* for defence purposes, while spontaneous gifts of money and materials have been made by grateful native rulers of the Malay States. A Volunteer Air Force and a Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve have been established in the Straits Settlements. As a result of reinforcements from India during August, Singapore is now the most strongly defended island of its size in the world. A garrison of some hundreds of sappers, gunners, and Indian troops has been established on Penang Island this year. A comprehensive defence plan has been adopted for Hong Kong, involving an

expenditure of nearly 300,000*l.*, and experts now consider that this colony would be capable of withstanding a siege indefinitely.

The defence of the West Indies is also being studied carefully both by the Imperial authorities and the local legislatures. Representations have been made for the re-establishment of the famous West India Regiment in Jamaica. As for the various territories held in Mandate by the Dominions, in each case steps have been taken during the last year to provide adequate garrisons and schemes for fortifications that could be erected in time of trouble. Australia is establishing a defence base at Papua and New Zealand is prepared to defend Samoa. Apart from the recently augmented police, South-West Africa has a Burgher Force with a potential establishment of 7000 trained European territorials. Nor is this strengthening of what may be termed indigenous defences the only mark of overseas preparedness. By means of the Royal Navy and innumerable garrisons of the Regular Army, Britain takes her share in the defence of the Dominions and Colonies, and both Services have recently extended their effectiveness overseas.

The integrity of imperial communications is vital not only to the Mother Country, dependent upon overseas supplies, but also to the scattered Dominions and Colonies, connected tenuously with their ultimate sources of political and economic strength. Therefore, the Admiralty has given prior consideration to the protection of those communications, and Lord Stanhope, then First Lord of the Admiralty, was able to declare at the beginning of this year that the Navy was now fully equal to the task of 'maintaining the vital sea routes against any probable combination of foes.' \* Mr Geoffrey Shakespeare the Parliamentary and Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, made a further important statement in March 1939, when he outlined recent steps to counter the submarine and aerial menace to shipping. A large number of vessels have been constructed for defensive purposes.

The military representative of a European Power once remarked to me that he did not envy his colleagues of the British Empire, because they had territories in

---

\* See 'The Times,' Jan. 28, 1939.



all parts of the world to defend, while his country could concentrate on a few frontiers. The British reply to that expression of sympathy has been the development of sea and air power, with, more recently, the establishment of strong defensive bases in various parts of the world. Accordingly it has been possible to weave what may be described as a network of imperial defences across the globe. The Singapore Base, now fully equipped at a total cost of about 20,000,000*l.*, commands the direct route between the Far East and the Indian Ocean. The only other route passes through a dangerous labyrinth of islands, where a fleet could easily be ambushed. Indeed, a British fleet based at Singapore could dominate the Indian Ocean, the Dutch East Indies, New Guinea, Borneo, Australia, and New Zealand, besides affording protection to Hong Kong. Until recently, however, critics maintained that the usefulness of Singapore would be permanently impaired by the fact that Britain would never be able to spare a full battle fleet for the base.

It is true that until a short time ago Britain could not spare capital ships for Singapore without endangering her position in European waters. The Navy, thanks to unilateral disarmament, was no longer on a two-power basis. But the Navy has recently been enlarged by rapid building. Over 200 new vessels will be added this year, at the rate of nearly four a week, and it was recently announced that a large unit would be available for service at Singapore if an emergency should arise. Neither the number nor name of the vessels in question can be disclosed. But it may be revealed that, in the official view, they would be perfectly capable of protecting British interests, and, if necessary, taking offensive action.

The fortification mentioned earlier of Penang Island, at the other end of the Straits of Malacca from Singapore, completes the Malayan stranglehold, while the establishment of a new naval and air base at Trincomalee in Ceylon, to cost 1,500,000*l.* this year, will mark the third point of an important defensive triangle, which may become a quadrangle by connection with the new Australian base at Darwin. Similarly South Africa is strengthening Robben Island and Simonstown, and Canada has greatly improved the vital bases at Halifax and Esquimalt. Bermuda, which commands the Southern



Atlantic route, is being modernised—and still the tale is but half-told. There are also the Mediterranean bases, not to mention various new projects still on the Secrets List. But enough has been said to demonstrate the important rôle of the Navy in the arming of the overseas Empire.

As to the Regular Army overseas, it has lately been subjected to a minor revolution. So long ago as 1882 the Carnarvon Commission reported: 'The stations far distant from the United Kingdom and in close proximity to the stations of foreign Powers are liable to sudden attack, and cannot be reinforced without long delay; their garrisons, therefore, must be kept up to war strength.' This recommendation remained for some time in its appropriate pigeon-hole until the Government recently decided to adopt that advice and abandon its policy of making overseas garrisons dependent on reinforcements. The garrisons, to quote Mr Hore-Belisha, 'will now be maintained at a strength adequate for their responsibilities of defence at the outbreak of war.' The raising of local forces is to be encouraged, and, 'whenever it be possible to employ further local personnel for anti-aircraft and coast defence duties in particular, whether in combination with British personnel or otherwise, the practice will be followed.'\* This is an important development. It means that we are now going to tap the enormous reserves of native man-power at our disposal. But it also implies a welcome recognition by the Government of the fact that bases are useless without garrisons, and sea-power itself depends largely upon military support at vital points.

There is yet another feature of recent Empire re-armament that involves a minor revolution in strategic conceptions. Reference has already been made to the theory that the British Empire's main weakness is the wide dispersal of its members. The growth of air power had, according to the theorists, aggravated this weakness. It was asserted that Britain had at last been deprived of the advantages of its insularity: not only would it be unable to protect its far-flung dependencies against guerrilla aerial attack, but its own vital areas and

---

\* See 'The Times,' March 9, 1939.

munitions factories would be open to devastation at close-range. But the position now is—or soon will be—that the most important outlying parts of the Empire may supply their own air weapons, or receive them from somewhere near, while the Mother Country will no longer be dependent solely upon its own exposed factories for the constant stream of aircraft required in an emergency. Both Canada and Australia have undertaken to manufacture warplanes on behalf of the United Kingdom and New Zealand has accepted an invitation to establish a factory.

The pundits have agreed that a chief factor of success in any large-scale war of the future will be the ability to maintain supplies, particularly of aircraft, in the face of constant attack. To quote Rougeron, that cool-headed French authority, the rise of air-power embarrasses 'those countries who will be constrained to produce their war *matériel* under the blows of a hostile aviation. It favours those who can supply a front with *matériel* produced beyond the range of that action.' Thanks to the co-operation of the Dominions, the British Empire should be in the happy position of a Power with well-dispersed, comparatively invulnerable sources of supply. The far-flung structure of the Empire has at last proved to be not a weakness but a strength.

But it must be admitted that a survey such as this would be incomplete without some factual demonstration of the Empire's unity. Take, then, the case of Canada, which has had leanings toward neutrality in the past and is often cited by doubters as a possible benevolent neutral in war. Three modern developments have cured Canada of her tendency towards isolation. One is the growth of air power, which brings this Dominion within range of Europe; the second is the growing economic penetration of Canada by the United States of America; and the third the recent visit of their Majesties the King and Queen which stirred imperial patriotism marvellously. Canada anyhow realises now that it is better to be balanced between two great forces than to be the helpless satellite of one of them. If Britain fell, then Canada would also fall—under the control of Washington. Mr Mackenzie King recently translated this realisation into policy when he deliberately recalled Sir Wilfrid Laurier's declaration

in 1910 that 'if England is at war, we are at war.' This was an expression of Liberal policy as accepted before, stated Mr King, and 'he wished to offer it as a statement of the Liberal policy as it was to-day and would continue under the Liberal administration.' \*

As to Australia, Mr Menzies, her Prime Minister, recently applauded the declaration of Lord Halifax on British foreign policy. 'If pursuit of that policy means trouble or even war for Britain,' he said, 'there need be no doubt that the trouble or endurance of the trials of war will be shared by the people of Australia.' † Similarly New Zealand's responsible politicians have continually echoed their Prime Minister Mr Savage's clear-cut statement of last year that 'wherever Britain is, we must be.' As for South Africa, a move towards neutrality has been defeated by General Smuts' vigorous forcing of the issue; and it should be noted that General Hertzog himself made the following remarkable statement in the House of Assembly on April 12, 1939 :

'Great Britain is South Africa's greatest friend. Thanks to the attitude of that friend ever since the Anglo-Boer War, and after, when the Republics were first handed back, and later when the whole of South Africa was given to the people, South Africa possesses the status she enjoys to-day. That country to-day is our great friend, and I shall be the last to do anything towards breaking that friendship.'

It might be added—but these are not General Hertzog's words—that South Africa realises fully what would be her fate and the fate of her goldfields if Britain were defeated in a German war. And these declarations have since been reinforced.

DONALD COWIE.

---

\* See editorial in 'The Empire Review,' March, 1939.

† See 'The British Australian and New Zealander,' July 6, 1939.

## Art. 10.—MUSEUMS. ✓

1. *A Report on the Museums and Art Galleries of the British Isles (other than the National Museums)*. By S. F. Markham, M.P. Edinburgh, Constable. 1938.
2. *The Carnegie United Kingdom Trust: Twenty-fifth Annual Report. January—December 1938*. Edinburgh, Constable. 1939.
3. *Report on the Progress and Condition of the United States National Museum for the Year ended June 30, 1938*. United States Government Printing Office. 1939.

EARLY in August of this year a letter written by Lord Harewood appeared in 'The Times' in which, as the Chairman of the Sudeley Committee, whose aim it is to secure facilities for the general public in museums, picture-galleries, and historic buildings, he drew attention to the great advance made recently in the methods of arranging and describing exhibits attractively and in securing other conditions of advantage to the visitors to such institutions. He added, however, that further requirements, as for instance in the better provision of refreshments, were still called for, and raised the question of more use being made of the Soane Museum in Lincoln's Inn Fields; but that is another story for another occasion.

To that communication, Mr S. F. Markham, M.P., in his capacity as President of the Museums Association, while generally endorsing the suggestions made by Lord Harewood, replied that the fundamental problems of finance and adequate salary scales for the staffs should first be considered; and Lord Bledisloe, as an ex-President of the Museums Association, followed by pleading for a far more thorough-going and all-round treatment of the question. 'The museums of this country are crying aloud for more definite encouragement and systematisation, as indispensable channels of education and culture, under the ægis of the Government.' Unfortunately, at about that stage in the discussion, the clouds of threatening war began to gather from the direction of Danzig and the prospects of peace in Europe darkened so swiftly that a promising correspondence came to an abrupt end. And now the outbreak of war has shelved the question, we hope for not too long a time.

Yet, in the meanwhile, even with heavy considerations and anxieties occupying the public mind, it would be well not altogether to lose sight of the questions that Lord Harewood has raised; for culture will be more necessary than ever to help in mending the ills that war causes. The weapons of the spirit must be kept as efficient and bright as those used in physical conflict; and after the stress and the victory there is bound to be an immeasurable call for the influences of culture, through learning and the arts, to remove the signs and mischiefs of the havoc done and to rebuild a vitally essential structure of thought, beauty, and generosity. Without such ideals as are there implied this life would become like a dingy alley leading to a blank impasse, or else it would be a mere nightmare madness. Therefore we must not allow any preoccupations, however searching, to lead us to forget the influences for lasting good and spiritual re-creation that are represented by such agencies as libraries, museums, and picture-galleries, or such forums of public thought as give opportunity for the expression of that gospel of 'sweetness and light' which Matthew Arnold looked for and John Ruskin, the generally forgotten, urgently taught.

With an opportuneness that is encouraging, three publications have recently been issued which renew the question, at least of the value of the lesser museums, in a lasting and stimulating manner. Under the auspices of the Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, Mr Markham, whose opinion we have quoted already, made a wide survey of public museums in the British Isles, other than those that are national, and with a brightness rare in any publication issued in a paper cover of government blue has written a report containing the opinions he has formed from his experiences and added to them certain conclusions of a far-reaching yet available character. Almost simultaneously with that statement, which will be the main basis of the following remarks, the Carnegie Trustees have produced their twenty-fifth annual report, which includes a section describing their general activities during the quarter-century that has passed since the foundation of their Trust. These activities, so far, have been more devoted to developing the resources and value of libraries and picture-galleries than of museums; but the progress they

have made for the betterment of museums since the beginning of last year promises that in time this branch of their work and generosities will be as extensive as the others.

We also have received from the Smithsonian Institution in Washington the latest annual report of the United States National Museum, which brings out clearly the devotion to, and very wide range of, American scientific endeavour in its departments of anthropology, biology, geology, arts and industries, and history. It is evident from this report that the Museum gives almost exclusive attention to science and does not nearly cover the extensive and varied regions of interest achieved by the British Museum at Bloomsbury and South Kensington. Yet in educational work it is evident that their activities increase with every year, while in their exhibition halls they display regularly, and at the due times rearrange and bring up to date, great series of objects that demonstrate facts of many kinds 'on subjects ranging from the tools and dress of primitive man to complicated modern machinery, examples of the life of strange lands, of the elements that compose the earth, fossil animals and plants of former ages, and many other things.' It is, therefore, no mere show-place for holiday minds and rambles, but an institution carefully designed and used to forward the knowledge that helps the practical interest of civilisation; while incidentally it proves so attractive that in the single month of July 1937 the Museum was visited by nearly half a million people, and just under two and a half million passed through its doors during the whole of 1938. Its usefulness is enhanced through excavations and anthropological and other researches carried out or supported by members of its staff in North and South America, while it keeps closely in touch and frequently exchanges specimens with the British Museum and the National Museum of Canada.

Our present concern, however, is with the general subject as covered by Mr Markham's report—that is, with the museums of these islands, excluding those which are national and maintained by the Government—and to consider his views as to what may best be done to make those institutions more attractive and helpful to the community as a whole. So very slow over the



years was the general progress, so to call it, made for their improvement—and still Mr Markham declares that many might as well be forthwith brought to an end—that many a middle-aged man, and doubtless others who are younger, can easily remember the apparent hopelessness and worse of their conditions sometimes. Odds and ends of bones and fragments of skulls, with fading fly-marked descriptions ill-written on fusty cards, were left to decay under the rarely cleaned glass lids of poorly joined cases; while birds, their plumage unnaturally moulting and the sheen gone, standing on shelves in dull regularity, stared at a dingy nothing with eyes which were evidently just black beads. Fragments of stone, architectural modelling of little interest to archæologists and of no interest to the general public, mouldered on shelves and in untidy corners; while other examples of supposed historic or biological or antiquarian interest were scattered here and there incongruously, although many of those lame exhibits with a little care given to their better appearance might well have found right and acceptable places in certain museums elsewhere.

It is needless to exemplify further the neglect suffered and the spoilt interest of such exhibits as once on a time were almost habitual to the local museums of provincial towns even of some size and pretensions, for any one who had ventured into their pathetic and repulsive rooms must have witnessed it, as well as been conscious of the stagnant air, the blotted glass of cases and windows, the clogged dust on shelves and floors—all evidence undeniable of the truth that the museum, instead of being an institution of enlightenment, had become too often a neglected lumber-room. I have the added recollection on one occasion, on visiting the museum of a seaside town that possessed much historical and archæological interest, of finding the man in attendance—curator was hardly the word—who looked rather like a cousin of Mrs Gummidge, sidling up to me to grumble about his inadequate pay, with the result that on that occasion the depressed visitor was led to leave a piece of silver in an expectant palm as a return for his release from a place which should or might have been made a vital centre of interest and cheerfulness, instead of the sordid abode of gloom that it was. Of that poor attendant or of the



poverty of that museum one must not think with contempt, for both were the victims of circumstances. Too many a museum has been set up on the meanest of financial bases, and attendants must eat.

It will be convenient to state now briefly the main purposes for which museums exist or should exist. As declared by Mr Markham, whose value as a guide grows rapidly with every new use made of him, those functions are three: to collect and conserve objects of cultural importance; to assist research workers, students, etc., in every possible way; and, finally, to educate and inspire. Important as each of those purposes is, we feel that the third and least defined is the best of them; for the reason that through the inspiration, perhaps indirect and even unconscious, gained from some object or group of objects many a visitor must have received a light that otherwise would not have quickened within him. Some good citizens, doubtless, have drifted into a museum through the idlest curiosity or the lack of an umbrella, and in a glimpse, half inconsiderate as might be of some particular object, have gathered as in a flash something of intellectual or spiritual value that continued in their hearts and minds to colour and interest lives which through dull surroundings or mechanical routine of work had grown humdrum and drab. With the imagination touched, many wonders may be revealed, as is shown by the countryman of Thomas Hardy's poem who, entering the British Museum, gave his attention to one thing only—a stone from the Areopagus of Athens. He could not get over the fact that actually he was looking at a stone which 'had echoed the voice of Paul.'

As Mr Markham says, that is one facet of inspiration—and it is one among countless others—recalling examples casually, hurriedly gathered, as when John Keats, in the British Museum, discovering a Grecian urn, found his genius fired and he was inspired to sing in words that endure of the immortalities of many things which to the passing sight appear transient:

'When old age shall this generation waste  
Thou shalt remain in midst of other woe  
Than our's, a friend to man, to whom thou say'st,  
"Beauty is truth, truth beauty,"—that is all  
Ye know on earth, and all ye need to know.'

An eternal gospel that also Keats voiced elsewhere. But leaving genius, exceptional and inexplicable, amongst its exaltations to come to the ordinary man wandering perhaps a little lost in the Natural History Museum, and brought suddenly to realise the significance of the circles in the section of the great tree shown there. Year by year they marked its girth with one, among others in that slow series, especially indicated to show just how it was in the year when Chaucer was born. The least imaginative and emotional observer must be thrilled at having brought clearly to him the truth of that old tree having been a vigorous actual part of the forest just at the time when, say, Edward III or Henry V or Elizabeth reigned. In those exactitudes Nature proved herself as fine an historian as the bee has proverbially justified its faculties as a good botanist.

So, easily and casually, a glance, a glimpse may reveal to a mind attuned to it, as by a magic touch, scenes which shine again from out of that evidence—a copy of Magna Carta bringing to mental sight the field of Runnymede with the evil John furious, but cowed by his steel-clad barons; the skeleton of the prehistoric monster, colossal, and the world sweltering, lost in misty swamps; mummies, some royal, and therefore the more pathetic, framed in the gloomy ritual of Egyptian temples; Assurbanipal, in bas-relief, standing in his chariot and flinging deathful spears; birds in proud plumage that bring to visionary thought stifling tropical forests with the deepest of green shadows accentuating patches of tyrannical sunlight; books laboriously, lovingly inscribed and brightly enamelled, the works of years in scriptoria; with the letters of literary geniuses, illustrative of personal character, displayed in cases near them—and so one may continue, gathering from our rich collections impressions which kindle thoughts of things seen or read about.

Such examples belong, it is true, to the national museums which are maintained with a lavish generosity; yet similarly the lesser museums, also, have inspirations to yield to those who are not mole-blind; and this is why the third of the functions of such institutions as detailed by Mr Markham seems to us the most important of them, for from beginnings apparently trifling an influence may deepen and go on, unseen yet unfailingly, like the watery

rings of a pool disturbed by a cast stone, the ripples extending in ever-widening circles. To many curators who know the general character of their visitors this idea may seem fantastic, but the germ is there. So let the possibility not be forgotten. Something of the manner in which such an effect may be worked out is revealed in a passage from Mr Markham's Introduction :

'On this inspirational side of a museum's functions probably no one has done harder thinking than that great headmaster Sanderson, of Oundle, who however preferred to describe his ideal as a "Temple of Vision." . . . What Sanderson had in mind was an inspiring museum of universal history and the world as a whole, giving a unified conception of the world drama in which the boys would play their part. This inspirational function was to be achieved by a selected series of exhibits, supplemented by charts of Man's progress and records of his greatest deeds. This ideal might well have tested the calibre of a greater than Sanderson, since there is no common denomination of inspiration ; but if inspiration be defined as setting in motion the dynamo of great and lofty ideals, then the world is infinitely poorer because of the accident of Sanderson's death before he could carry out his idea.'

It may be remembered, also, although it is not named among the stated functions of a museum, that it may serve, if more or less rightly representative, as a microcosm, an aspect in miniature of the whole world, ordered in acceptable series, and bringing results similar to those enjoyed when persons go sight-seeing. During the recent summer the children of many schools were taken in parties to countries abroad. A large contingent, for example, went from Dundee to central Italy, and to judge from what was seen of it there can be no measuring the excellent results on mind and spirits obtained by such a visit. It was an instance of impressionable youths entering, after having seen other places, that marvellous museum of ancient and modern history which had been known to mankind for thousands of years as the immortal City of Rome : with its exceptional examples of all kinds—within its borders—of religious authority and government, of rich ethnographical evidence, and how much more than even a copious, illustrated guide-book might garner and tell ! A visit to so sacred and ancient a place outdoes, of course, any museum, in its power of

appeal, for that point actually is where Julius Cæsar was slain and here, it may be, where St Peter was martyred ; while also through the slow processes of early and mediæval and modern times that supreme city saw picturesque and world-moving events. . . . But not all can go to Rome, though all roads lead there, and every intelligently run museum serves in some respects to build the dream which those who are unable to travel may yet enjoy.

It is time that we turned to more practical aspects of the lesser museums in these islands. It is a large question and evasive because of the diversities in their character, conditions, and appeal. The possibility, which in some cases has been proved, of their being valuable adjuncts to teaching points to their future development as parts of the national educational system. But their usefulness must be something more than merely instructive.

At present their value is limited through scarcity and too-frequent inefficiency. The distribution of museums over these islands has been so entirely haphazard that large parts of Scotland, a country distinguished for the earnest appreciation of learning by its people poor and rich, have no museums at all, as is true also of central Ireland ; while there are no less than seventy within a few miles of Charing Cross. Such irregularity is baffling to any attempt at systematisation ; while in many towns where they are established they have lapsed into shabby failures, serving little good, and are so discouraging that in many instances it would be best to close them and pool elsewhere such of their exhibits as might be worth keeping ; while not forgetting Mr Markham's reminder that much seeming ' rubbish ' may have a revealing value as social evidence in years to come. Some of those ' poverty-stricken institutions that repel rather than inspire ' were founded by learned societies and benevolent people ; but, whatever were their original purposes, without sufficient means or personal enthusiasm to maintain them they were bound to grow dingy and futile and to fail.

At the other extreme, as measured by their popularity, are the museums devoted to the *personalia* of literary or other geniuses ; shrines and temples for thousands of pilgrims who are eager to worship the shadows of greatness.

The old vicarage at Haworth, a centre for the fervent admirers of the Brontës, Nelson's gallery at Greenwich, Wolfe's home at Westerham, and that of Keats, which is at Hampstead—these are of the aristocracy of such institutions and farther removed from the depressing edifices that have little more to show than faded birds, parts of skeletons, and fossils than is daylight from dark. As Mr Markham says, that sort of museum 'is a development not only popular with its combined appeal of the historical, the personal, and the architectural; but is also educational, in that at its best it brings vividly before the younger generation the lives of great men.'

He refers with particular approval to Stratford-on-Avon, which as a pilgrim-shrine to Shakespeare, he declares, sets a standard. As it does so overwhelmingly that to many it has grown beyond goodness. The attractiveness of the associations of what must once have been a charming Warwickshire town on the banks of a delightful river is spoilt for many by the commercialism that has come to it through the success of the Shakespearean spell. The worship of the Swan of Avon has become like a hurrying, thriving business with a shilling admission to most of the buildings associated with his life and legend. To his mother's (Mary Arden) home at Wilmcote, with its excellent collection of contemporary agricultural implements, one shilling; to Anne Hathaway's cottage at Shottery, one shilling; for sightseers to visit the church with his tomb and wall-monument—actually—one shilling; to be shown over the interior of the new theatre when it is empty, one shilling. Lastly there is the birthplace, and compared with all else that appears cheap for the mere shilling. Those popular places must, of course, be kept, cleaned, and taken care of and the work of doing so decently paid for; but the commercial insistence and large amounts paid for admission to them does distract from the charm and is an undue tax on many people. The cloak of genius is not improved by that sort of silver lining.

An added disadvantage of the unusual popularity of such shrines was revealed to me at Shakespeare's birthplace on both the occasions that I was there. The anxiety of the custodians to get rid of visitors as soon as possible after they were admitted was evident. If one paused to study some detail, at once the watchful,

courteous attendant was at one's elbow pointing out another interesting exhibit nearer the door of exit. One might not linger anywhere, so that before one had time to feel the call of the sanctuary one was out of it again, unsatisfied, with a sense of having been not so much hustled as prevented from enjoying what should have been a more reverent, contemplative pilgrimage. All that—and it is not imaginary—was the result in detail, small but yet actual, of too much success. It is a pity that some of that over-care and a proportion of those shillings could not have been distributed during the years to other worthy but less spectacular museums.

The necessity of watchfulness in any gallery is, of course, important. Too many people, alas, have a kink for collecting souvenirs, and it seems that those ill-gotten are more precious and delightful to possess than the other kind; while there must be something crucially fascinating to the clever thief in abstracting an exhibit from a closed case under the eyes and noses of its caretakers. The recent 'conveying' from the Louvre of the Watteau 'L'Indifference,' as of the earlier rape of the 'Mona Lisa,' is an example of the way in which a thrill of sinister effect may be enjoyed by the criminal adventurer; and evidently the passion for such achievement is bred in the bone. It is not only the act of purloining under watchfulness that, with the moral considerations left out, may be taken as brazenly clever; but also the astuteness with which the other objects in a case may sometimes be swiftly rearranged to hide the fact that something had been taken. Often faked replicas have been prepared to replace the articles stolen.

The trouble that comes with the necessary watchfulness is that some proportion of the less intelligent of the attendants wear suspicion too plainly in their faces—and that is more than enough to kill the enjoyment of any decently sensitive visitor. This, no doubt, is a small point, but like other trifles it represents a tendency which may grow tiresome. I remember, for example, entering with a friend a delightful museum that occupied three floors in a fine old house. It had a system of watchfulness so blatant that it must have tempted delinquents to try their luck. The place had few, if any, other visitors at the time. As soon as we approached the section on the



first storey a loud bell rang and a man, not in uniform, appeared, who took post near us and in a half-hearted fashion distantly companioned us everywhere about the room, until, the visit to that floor ended, he vanished and another loud bell announced our proceeding to the floor above, where another attendant appeared.

Such tactlessness—for I cannot believe our appearance was as suspicious-looking as all that!—was really stupidly bad manners and almost as plain as a bald accusation of the intention to steal. A softer bell, anyhow, would have been more considerate. There must be means, of course, in every museum, to ensure the safety of the treasures; but the visitor should not be made to feel that he is there on sufferance and under suspicion. One means towards good watching without obtrusiveness would be to have mirrors in the ceiling from which, without his knowing it, the movements and standings-still of every stranger might be inoffensively followed by a seated attendant; while any attempt to steal would at once be detected. Methods of the sort should be tried, for it adds to the value and enjoyment of such places to be able to go about them unhampered; and after all, if you can't get decent manners in a museum, which surely exists to present examples of the noble past, where are they to be found?—while the spying that is obvious is a rudeness to innocence.

Such a want as that is, of course, exceptional; for as a rule custodians in museums, like all the other officials, are courteous, considerate, soft-voiced, and often perhaps inclined to seem moribund. In the poorest of such institutions there is, of course, reason for looking melancholy and falling asleep, as the surroundings and atmosphere generally are as solemn as the dreariest dormitory. But there is a remedy for it. Poor custodianship is a consequence of ill pay, and that, in turn, is the result of insufficient means of upkeep for the whole place; while how could custodianship be intelligent and good in rooms containing nothing that is worth stealing?

Mr Markham gives instances of gifts, which found in a dustbin would be taken as refuse, accepted by curators who are unable to say 'No' for fear of offending the donors. One museum notes among its accessions 'Part of a skull, probably that of a hare, picked up on a



railway'; while elsewhere there were a 'Freak egg of Leghorn,' a section of a water-pipe and German bomb, and a stuffed domestic cat; while here are some of the exhibits displayed in one museum-case somewhere in Scotland: fossils, Greek and Roman lamps, incense used in Mohammedan mosques, an unlabelled photograph of a native, a picture-postcard of the Colosseum, a mounted hedgehog, bottles of water labelled Grand Canal, Venice, Bonny Doon, and Rhine, an umbrella and a whalebone-ribbed 'gamp,' a 'Bible complete' (which happened, however, to be only a label, for the Bible was missing), portions of the pulpit and baptistery of the first Spurgeon's tabernacle, a hundred British beetles (but not all were there), a string of beads worn by Cetewayo of the Zulus when he was captured, and two religious tracts.

The first step towards curing the defects of the poorest museums, and necessary if those institutions are to serve their localities and the country worthily, is to give them a living maintenance. Something less than one and a half million pounds is spent annually on all the British museums; and of that sum, which looks rather mean compared with the astronomical figures of other national expenditure (especially when a war is on), two-thirds go to the seventeen leading museums in London, Edinburgh, and Cardiff, and less than half a million to the remaining seven hundred and seventy. The result of such indifference and neglect is that in many cases the salaries paid are humiliatingly small. Mr Gladstone once expansively declared that the curator must 'regard the amenities of his profession to be an ample recompense for his toil'—an easy attitude for an imperial statesman to adopt, but hardly suited to a prosaic sphere wherein taxes are taken, rates are demanded, and bills for supplies must somehow be met.

But first to appreciate the duties of those officers. Sir Henry Miers, who twelve years ago made the first survey and report of this kind for the Carnegie Trust and as an expert is outstanding, has said: 'The curator should be a fountain of inspiration. He should be accessible to inquirers (some of the most competent have to answer hundreds of inquiries during a month) and he should make his museum a meeting-place for various clubs and societies, an encouragement to all seekers

after knowledge, and an educational centre for the town.' Evidently by that he must aim to be one of our supermen, and more tolerable and helpful than most of such oddities ; in any case a person of particular value. Well, the part-time salary of the chief official of the museum at an important town in Yorkshire—the name is given by Mr Markham, but need not be set down here—is assessed at 10*l.* per annum, paid out of a total yearly grant to the museum of 100*l.*, from which nearly 12*l.* is deducted for rates—and that detail is enough to keep the curator awake ! At a flourishing industrial town in the Home Counties a newspaper-advertisement invited applications for ' a male assistant ' with practical museum and art-gallery experience and other qualifications, for a whole-time job to receive a salary of 115*l.* ; whereas the wages of an ordinary dustman of the London County Council come to 150*l.* a year. Something, it seems, must be wrong somewhere.

And of course much is wrong in many ways ; but also there is plenty of good and very good in the prospects and achievements of the museums, and now that through the investigations of the Carnegie Trust the good and the bad, the possibilities, and the defects are recognised, it should be possible—were permitting—to plan for the future. To make the lesser museum a more valuable influence in the cultural life of towns and villages requires the right people to work it, the right building to house it in, and a clear but not narrow idea of what it will have to do. For the human elements, money must be granted sufficiently and with regularity, grants rather than subscriptions, to pay fair salaries and wages and keep the rooms clean and sweet, well-lighted, and healthily ventilated, so that a trained staff may work there with the ease that brings efficiency and afterwards keenness. The officials should be helped in their policy by committees nominated, if possible, from the members of scientific societies and art clubs in the neighbourhood, with such persons of culture added as may be available ; while there should be vital links with the Board of Education, though according to a memorandum drawn up by the Museums Association there should also be limits to that connection, because museums are not fundamentally educational institutions.

The question of the buildings is important and requires more consideration than might at first appear. There is, Mr Markham declares—and as well we know, being on the whole a sentimental community—a most quixotic paradox in practice, to preserve old houses by converting them into museums, a process which not only ensures, more or less, that they shall be out of date in sanitary and other respects, but tends to the destruction of often irreplaceable museum material. Not having been built for the special purpose of preserving and exhibiting treasures, the difficulties of lighting, heating, drying, storage, and watching such places often become almost insuperable ; while those enemies of old houses the death-watch and the powder-post beetles penetrate to destroy the wood of the structure, with moths and mites ‘and such small deer’ defying all efforts of fumigation and spraying—and so their merry work of destruction goes on. It is estimated that through the normal processes of time a new and carefully preserved series of natural history objects lasts for only about sixty years, which shows how urgent is the need for its right housing and the use of modern building materials. The appearance, outward and inward, of the museum also needs thought. It should be bright with sympathetic colours, and the edifice if possible set in a green and restful garden. Cheerfulness too rarely has been a companion of science—yet why not ?

Then, briefly, as to the future. The uses of the museums, as soon as conditions permit, should be generously extended and made more real. A general policy, an establishment of main principles, definite in terms, though not too rigorous, lest the individuality of an institution should be cramped, might be worked out by the Museums Association or other qualified executive—in one instance to enrich and co-ordinate that social side of the museum which interests or entertains and is, whether he knows it or not, a true part of the spiritual sustenance of the ordinary citizen ; and in the other instance, with the sympathetic co-operation of the Board of Education to organise series of lectures, studies, etc., whereby museums would become closer adjuncts to the schools, through arranging exhibitions or supplying objects on loan to illustrate the words spoken. The radio is already a valuable auxiliary to education, and its uses in elementary

and secondary education, having been tested for some years, are evidently found worth while. How thrilling it would be if through the radio a lecturer, who might be speaking from anywhere between the Poles, discoursed on the things about him, whether tropical, temperate, or frigid, and there in museums for the benefit of his eager audiences miles beyond his ken were objects and pictures on show in attractive arrangement to make his words more real. The most distant regions might thereby be brought very close to everyone hearing. It is not an impossible fancy.

Folk-museums, which represent to the present day the realities of living—habitations, dress, industry, utensils, and implements—of the old times before (or behind) us, are a development worth encouraging, and to which the Government under the pressure of social historians once gave encouragement. Such a museum on national lines by this time would probably have been established if the financial slump which oppressed pretty well the whole world a few years ago had not prevented. In some places about the country folk-museums have been founded, in old tithe-barns and otherwise, with representations of the past life and conditions there reconstructed. Mr Markham prints two photographs showing a smithy and a turnery as displayed in the National Museum of Wales; the former with horseshoes on the floor as when smiths were at work with anvil, hammer, square on wall, besom, forge, and other incidentals of the grand old craft before the machine swept civilisation to a whirr and left the horse labouring behind. So, too, with the turnery; its benches and driving wheel and the place thickly littered with shavings. So rapid are the changes of these hurrying times that it is refreshing to see, even in 'mimic show,' those old places again, with their signs of simple but sure prosperity and ease, instead of the present slickness and rush and merciless so-called progress. It is futile to sigh for a return of the old days and ways; but some of the more elderly of us, whose lives have seen so much of the folly, selfishness, and cruelty of things, are glad to recall in these and any ways an age that was quieter, happier, more satisfying, and secure than this that is being forced on us and with which so often we find we are out of tune.

Such are instances, gathered somewhat piecemeal, of the ways in which the work and influence of local museums may be extended with benefit to the community ; and beyond them still is that ideal of the great schoolmaster Sanderson, quoted earlier, of their becoming ' Temples of Vision,' as he said. And as they should be. One way of bringing about that desirable improvement, and anything which adds to the spiritual life of a people is most desirable, is for those settled near a museum to get into the way of regarding it as a living part of their intellectual life and their civilisation. This must be done through humane and cultural means, of which music would be the chief. Concerts should be given in the museums, after the intention of, even though the quality could not be equal to, those held earlier in the year at Stafford House, with lectures and discussions on literary, historical, and travel subjects in a bright environment, with cheerful curtains and pictures.

In such ways the simplest museum might become, as indeed it should be, a living, generally accepted centre of brightness and delight in a village, town, or district, to which citizens might go with the confidence of finding there inspiration and happiness of heart and the sustaining recreations of social intercourse.

WHITWELL M. DODD.

**Art. 11.—NATIONAL UNITY AND PARTY GOVERNMENT.**

1. *Beyond Politics*. By Christopher Dawson. Sheed and Ward, 1939.
2. *L'Homme d'Etat. Analyse de L'Esprit Politique*. Par Jules Kornis. Libraire Félix Alcan, 1938.
3. *Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties*. By M. Ostrogorski. 2 vols. Macmillan, 1902.
4. *Dissertation on Parties*. By Viscount Bolingbroke. 1733-4.
5. *Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents* (1770) : *Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs* (1791). By Edmund Burke.
6. *Edmund Burke*. By Sir Philip Magnus. Murray, 1939.

NATIONAL unity is at all times an attractive ideal. Under certain circumstances it may become vital to the safety of the State. Under such circumstances Great Britain finds herself to-day. Once more the British Empire is at war. Never have the demonstrations of national, nay, imperial unity been more impressive. As one man the whole Empire stands behind the King-Emperor to defend a cause which, with him, all his peoples believe to be the cause of justice, liberty, and righteousness. Into the long train of events which have led up to the present disastrous and deplorable situation it were beyond the immediate purpose of this paper to inquire. It must suffice to say that, by the rape of Czechoslovakia and the assault upon Poland's independence and integrity, Herr Hitler has not merely aroused the bitter indignation of Poland's allies, but has challenged the good opinion of the civilised world. The most remarkable feature of the present situation is, indeed, the rapidity and unanimity with which in the British democracies, and in France, the challenge of Herr Hitler's has been accepted, and the real issues at stake have been, by the common folk, discerned. It is surely one of the cases, less rare perhaps than is generally supposed, when things that are hidden from the wise and prudent are more clearly revealed to babes. Simplicity is sometimes a superior guide to conduct than argument. The philosopher and the historian are apt to refine overmuch. The relative positions of Prussia and

Poland, for instance, are admittedly complicated by historical facts of which the learned are bound to take account. The intuition of the simple-minded brushes them impatiently aside. To them such complications count for nothing : they rightly apprehend that the issues now at stake are not German rights in Danzig, in the Polish Corridor, or anywhere else ; it is not a question of Poland's frontiers, historical or conventional ; the issue is something much more fundamental.

The straight and simple language of the King's historic message to his people precisely corresponds to the straight and simple outlook of his subjects. It is not only Principalities and Powers that we have to fight : it is, as Burke said, with 'armed doctrines that we are at war.' We are called, as the King said,

'to meet the challenge of a principle which, if it were to prevail, would be fatal to any civilised order in the world. . . . Such a principle, stripped of all disguise, is surely the mere primitive doctrine that might is right, and if this principle were established throughout the world, the freedom of our own country, and of the whole British Commonwealth of Nations, would be in danger. But far more than this—the peoples of the world would be kept in the bondage of fear, and all hopes of settled peace and of the security of justice and liberty among nations would be ended. This is the ultimate issue which confronts us.'

The issue could not have been put more plainly or more simply. The King's words have gone home to the heart and mind of all men of good will among all the peoples of the world. We and our allies are fighting to dispel a hideous nightmare : we are fighting for settled peace and the security of justice and liberty.

That the King has accurately defined the supreme issue all parties are agreed : they are also agreed that it is an issue on which we are both morally and politically compelled to fight : national unity is unbroken. It may, under these circumstances, appear contradictory and even paradoxical that at such a moment the two Opposition Parties in Parliament should have declined Mr Chamberlain's invitation to join a National Government, and thus add a further demonstration to the spectacle of national unity. In the most formal manner, in the



House of Commons, the acting-leader of the Labour Party, while pledging his Party to make their 'full contribution to the national cause,' made their position in this matter clear. 'We share,' he said, 'no responsibility in the tremendous tasks which confront the Government, but we have responsibilities of our own which we shall not shirk.' The Liberal Party arrived at a similar decision.

What does that decision imply? Is it a wise and right decision made in the best interests of the Commonwealth? One thing it assuredly does not mean. It implies no doubt whatever as to the inevitability of the war to which the Executive Government, with the complete concurrence of Parliament, has committed the country, or as to the justice of the cause for which the war is to be waged. On the contrary the Opposition leaders have occasionally shown impatience at what they regarded as the too tardy action of the Government. On that matter, then, there can be no ambiguity. All Parties are at one: why not then demonstrate unity by union? Mr Greenwood hinted not obscurely at the answer. To the English Parliamentary system an 'Opposition' is no less essential than a Government. It must, if possible, be in a position to provide an alternative administration. So long, said Mr Greenwood, as the 'relentless purpose (the final overthrow of Nazism) is pursued with vigour, with foresight, and with determination by the Government, so long will there be a united nation. But should there be confused councils, inefficiency, and wavering, then other men must be called to take their place.' That is sound constitutional doctrine; its affirmation may at the moment sound in some ears untimely; on the faces of many it may raise a smile. On the Opposition benches, as at present occupied, it would, indeed, be difficult to find material for the formation of an alternative Government. None the less Mr Greenwood's reminder was, in the abstract, opportune. It may well be, even in the present circumstances, that the best service the Opposition leaders could render to the State would be to preserve their Party integrity and independence. That question plainly involves much larger issues, in particular the relation between the Party system and the efficient working of Parliamentary

institutions. Is the Party system consistent with, or antagonistic to, or an essential ingredient in national unity under a Monarchy which is truly Parliamentary?

At first glance the question may seem almost otiose. Goldsmith pointed the antithesis in his famous rebuke to Burke :

' Who born for the universe narrowed his mind  
And to Party gave up what was meant for mankind.'

There we have the eternal antithesis : the Nation opposed to Party : the hopes of Unity destroyed by divisions which may degenerate into factions. But is the dichotomy accurate and exhaustive? Superficially it is. Men are slaves to catch-words ; proverbs play havoc with clarity of thought. ' Union is strength.' ' A house divided against itself cannot but fall.' Thus unity seems naturally to appeal to all men of good will : they look askance at Party divisions. Bolingbroke, one of the least consistent of politicians and one of the most fretful of philosophers, himself the leader of a Party, not to say a faction, lamented our ' national divisions ' :

' No grief hath lain more heavily at the hearts of all good men than those . . . about the spirit of party, which inspires animosity and breeds rancour ; which hath so often destroyed our inward peace ; weakened our national strength, and sullied our glory abroad. It is time, therefore, that all who desire to be esteemed good men . . . should join their efforts to heal our national divisions, and to change the narrow spirit of party into a diffusive spirit of public benevolence.'

Yet, in itself, unity may not be an unmixed blessing. A good deal depends on the means taken to secure it. Mechanical unity may be imposed by force ; the higher spiritual unity can proceed only from spontaneous promptings from within. Yet in a time of crisis, to repel external aggression, or to confront a domestic emergency, even mechanical unity may well be justified. The Roman Republic in the days of its primitive simplicity introduced into the fabric of its Constitution the device of Dictatorship. But in those days the office was strictly limited alike in functions and in duration. No dictator could retain office for more than six months. The Cæsarion dictatorship was of a different order, and modern dictatorships have conformed not to the primitive but

to the later type. Yet a prolonged 'dictatorship' is strictly a contradiction in terms. Prolonged beyond the emergency that *ex hypothesi* calls it into being, it must degenerate into a tyranny. The military dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell conformed to the true type. Though permitted by the constitutional instrument to nominate a successor Oliver was unable to hand on this authority to the son he nominated. Thus, after an interruption, purely temporary, the ancient and legal order was, with the cordial assent of all parties, restored.

National unity, clearly manifested at the Restoration of 1660, did not long survive it. The two historic Parties obtained their curiously inappropriate labels under Charles II, and from the 'Glorious Revolution' onwards the Party system gradually established itself as an indispensable adjunct to Parliamentary Government. Nevertheless, on the face of it, Party appears to be the negation of unity. The existence of Parties, with their organisation, implies a division of national forces. Divisions must spell weakness. Historical facts refute that conclusion: the development of Party Government alone made possible the evolution of the Cabinet: it saved Parliament itself from the chaos which threatened its existence, and it supplied the Whigs with an instrument wherewith to prosecute a successful foreign war and avert the outbreak of dynastic strife at home. There is, indeed, substance in the complaint persistently made by Lord Bolingbroke that the Whigs converted the accession of the Hanoverian Dynasty into a party triumph, and celebrated their triumph by excluding their Tory opponents not merely from official employment but from political life. Upon that text Bolingbroke preached more than one sermon. The 'Letter to Sir William Wyndham' (published in 1753) was, frankly, a personal apologia, an attempt to vindicate himself in the eyes of the Tory Party and of posterity.

The 'Dissertation on Parties' (1733-4) had a more ambitious purpose, and attempted to advance an argument of permanent validity. Yet, under the guise of a philosophical and historical treatise, the 'Dissertation' was in effect a political pamphlet designed for immediate consumption. Every argument that could be urged against the Party system was employed with consummate

ingenuity and eloquence to discredit Sir Robert Walpole and to prepare the way for Bolingbroke's readmission to public life. Neither object was attained.

Even more ambitious was the ultimate intention, and even more cynical the immediate purpose of 'The Patriot King' (1738). Cynicism could indeed hardly be carried further than an attempt to revive personal monarchy in favour of Frederick, Prince of Wales, whose timely decease fortunately frustrated any design the Prince might have entertained to put to a practical test the programme and principles of Bolingbroke. Yet despite its sinister purpose, and despite the superficiality of its philosophy, 'The Patriot King' played an important part in the evolution of Party Government.

'For some years it formed the manual of a large body of enthusiasts. From its pages George III derived the articles of his political creed. On its precepts Bute modelled his conduct. It called into being the faction known as the King's Friends. It undoubtedly contributed to bring about that great revolution which transformed the Toryism of Filmer and Rochester into the Toryism of Johnson and Pitt.'

Thus Churton Collins wrote in the *Quarterly Review* for April 1881. The passage contains a just estimate of Bolingbroke's services to his Party. As a political leader this 'modern Alcibiades' (as Walter Bagehot called him) was a splendid failure; his philosophy was shallow; but as a Party pamphleteer he was brilliantly successful. In his youthful essay 'The Vindication of the English Constitution' (1835) Disraeli paid a just tribute to the influence of his master and predecessor:—

'He eradicated from Toryism all the absurd and odious doctrines which Toryism had adventitiously adopted, clearly developed its essential and permanent character, discarded *jure divino*, demolished passive obedience, threw to the winds the doctrine of non-resistance, placed the abolition of James and the accession of George on their right bases, and in the complete reorganisation of the public mind laid the foundation for the future accession of the Tory Party to power and to that popular and triumphant career which must ever await the policy of an administration inspired by the spirit of our free and ancient institutions.'

If Bolingbroke failed in practical statesmanship, his failure was certainly not due to lack of brains, but to

lack of character. His most eminent disciple possessed both: nor is the debt of the pupil to the master difficult to trace. 'The State is become, under ancient and known forms, an indefinable monster: composed of a King without monarchical splendour, a Senate of Nobles without aristocratical independence, and a Senate of Commons without democratical freedom.' So Bolingbroke wrote in his 'Dissertation on Parties.' There is clearly more than an echo of Bolingbroke in the following passage (referring to the middle period of the eighteenth century) in Disraeli's 'Sybil' (1845).

'It could no longer be concealed that, by virtue of a plausible phrase, power had been transferred from the Crown to a Parliament, the members of which were appointed by an extremely limited and exclusive class, who owned no responsibility to the country, who debated and voted in secret, and who were regularly paid by the small knot of great families that by this machinery had secured the permanent possession of the King's Treasury. Whiggism was putrescent in the nostrils of the nation.'

To the young George III, as to Bolingbroke and Disraeli, the 'Venetian oligarchy,' established by the Revolution of 1688 and confirmed in power by the accession of the Hanoverian Elector, was anathema. George III 'determined to be King,' and in 1770 he administered the *coup de grâce* to the Whigs. Disintegrated by family feuds the Whigs paid the penalty usually demanded of a Party that has monopolised office too long. The young King put Lord North into power, where he was maintained by the King's personal influence and the control of the Treasury.\*

The most effective retort to the political theories of Bolingbroke and the political practice of the King came from the pen of Edmund Burke. The recent researches of Sir Philip Magnus have unfortunately revealed glaring inconsistencies between the public professions and the personal conduct of that superb rhetorician. But just resentment at the incongruity must not blind us to the splendour of Burke's eloquence or to the perspicuity of his

---

\* Effective illustration of these facts will be found in Mrs Villiers' *The Grand Whiggery*, published (Murray, 1939) since this paper was written.

analysis of the basic elements of the English Constitution. He was the first to perceive and proclaim the truth that Party organisation is the indispensable adjunct of Parliamentary Government. He went even further. 'Party divisions, whether on the whole operating for good or evil, are things inseparable from the Government.' With those words he begins his 'Observations on the Present State of the Nation' (1769).

The same thesis was maintained with greater elaboration in the 'Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents' (1770). The distempers of the time arose, he insisted, from the fact that the House of Commons was internally disorganised and out of touch with the electorate, and still more with the growing force of unrepresented public opinion which had been the chief source of the elder Pitt's power. The appropriate remedy for the latter defect was plainly an extension of the franchise and a redistribution of seats. But from this radical remedy Burke characteristically shrank. For the internal disorganisation of Parliament nothing, he maintained, would suffice but a revival of the Party system. 'Party,' he proclaimed in one of the most famous passages in all his treatises,

'Party is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principle on which they are all agreed. . . . Men thinking freely will, in particular instances, think differently. But still, as the greater part of the measures which arise in the course of public business are related to, or dependent on, some great leading principles in Government, a man must be peculiarly unfortunate in the choice of his political company if he does not agree with them nine times out of ten . . . and this is all that ever was required for a character of the greatest uniformity and steadiness in connection. How men can proceed without connection is to me incomprehensible.' \*

When Disraeli came to reconstruct the Tory Party after the Peelite schism, he did so largely on the principles of Bolingbroke and Burke. It must, however, be emphasised that Disraeli departed widely from the principles of Burke when in 1867 he 'shot Niagara' (in

---

\* 'Present Discontents,' pp. 375-8 (ed. 1854), and cf. 'Observations,' *passim*.



Carlyle's phrase), or (in Lord Derby's frank confession) 'made his leap in the dark.' Yet Disraeli, as Minister, was true to the principles he had proclaimed alike in his 'Vindication' and in his novels—particularly in 'Coningsby' and 'Sybil.' Nothing, indeed, could have been more strident than the criticism he directed against oligarchy, whether represented by the Whigs between 1714 and 1832 or by the 'Manchester School' between 1832 and 1867. On the other hand he was an intense believer in the principle of monarchy, though he realised that the Crown must look for support to an educated democracy, representing a contented people. 'Our society,' such is the daring conclusion reached in the 'Vindication,' 'is that of a complete democracy headed by an hereditary chief, the Executive and Legislative functions performed by two privileged classes of the Community, the whole body of the nation entitled, if duly qualified, to participate in the exercise of those functions, and constantly participating in them.'

In 'Coningsby' (1844) and 'Sybil' (1845) he proclaimed, under the guise of fiction, the same principles. 'Coningsby' was in fact a manifesto for the Young England Party, the leaders of which were George Smythe (the original of Coningsby), Lord John Manners, who figures in the novel as Lord Henry Sidney, Alexander Baillie Cochrane (the Buckhurst of 'Coningsby'), and Disraeli himself (who supplied something to the portrait of Sidonia). The young leaders found solid support in John Walter of 'The Times' (in part the type of Millbank), while Henry Hope provided them with a meeting-place amid the 'glades and galleries of the Deepdene.'

'Sybil' struck a deeper note. If 'Coningsby' owed much to the philosophy of Bolingbroke, distilled through the medium of the 'Vindication,' 'Sybil' made a definite contribution to the 'condition of England' question. In the social, economic and political conditions prevailing after Waterloo, Chartism had its nidus. They made a profound impression upon the young Disraeli, nor had he forgotten them when in 1874 he went to the Country on a policy of 'Sewage and Sentiment.' No parliament indeed had ever, up to that time, made such an important contribution to social and sanitary reform as the Disraeli Parliament of 1874-80. But that Parliament was still



a long way ahead. On July 12, 1839, Disraeli confessed to an astonished House of Commons that 'however much he disapproved of Chartism he sympathised with the Chartists.' 'Sybil' reflected that sympathy; and as Minister Disraeli proved, in 1867, and again between 1874 and 1880, that his sympathy was genuine, and that he was prepared to give practical effect to its promptings.

He was convinced that the root of Chartism, scotched though not killed by Peel's fiscal reforms, was to be found in the unhappy estrangement between rich and poor. That estrangement was a result of the earlier stages of the Industrial Revolution, and the divorce of the rural population from the land under the new agrarian economy. The widening gulf between class and class seemed, indeed, to the author of 'Sybil or the Two Nations,' to be by far the most serious feature of those Chartist days—far more serious than the disappointment of the working man in not obtaining from the Whigs of '32 the purely political concessions demanded in the Charter. Disraeli had not only made a careful study of the relevant blue-books, but had personally investigated conditions in the industrial districts. What impressed him was that a young Queen had been called to reign over two nations, 'between whom there is no intercourse and no sympathy, who are as ignorant of each other's habits as if they were dwellers in different zones, or inhabitants of different planets; who are formed by a different breeding, are fed by different food, are ordered by different manners, and are not governed by the same laws.'

Not until 1874 did the author of 'Coningsby' and 'Sybil' get a chance to prove that in these novels the real mind of Disraeli was revealed, and that he had never wavered in his determination to ameliorate the lot of common folk and to make that amelioration the supreme object of the 'new Toryism.'

Meanwhile, the Liberal Party still steadily adhered to the doctrine of *laissez-faire* *laissez-aller*, which had from the first inspired the policy of the 'Manchester School.' Of that school Bentham and Herbert Spencer were the prophets; John Bright and Richard Cobden were its most active missionaries; the Peelite Gladstone its most brilliant parliamentary leader. Thus during the Gladstone-Disraeli epoch Party lines were most clearly

marked, and—a significant concurrence—Parliamentary Government reached its highest pitch of perfection.\*

After 1885 two circumstances combined to blur the clear outline of the Party system. One was the schism in the Liberal Party, caused by Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule; the other was the increasing activity of a third Party in the House of Commons—that of the Irish nationalists. The coalition of the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists, initiated in 1886 and consummated in 1895, was powerful enough to outvote the Liberal remnant and the nationalists combined. But the Unionist Party, disintegrated by the fiscal schism, was shattered at the General Election of 1906. The great Liberal majority then returned rendered the Governments of Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith independent of the Irish vote until 1910. Both the elections of 1910, however, resulted in a tie between Liberals and Conservatives, with the result that the Irish nationalists were able to impose their terms upon the Liberals, who, on humiliating sufferance, retained office until the outbreak of the Great War.

By that time a fourth Party had appeared in the House of Commons. A few trade-unionists had found their way into Parliament from 1884 onwards but had generally acted with the Liberal Party. A new Labour Party came to the birth, however, in 1900, and in 1906 ran 50 candidates of whom no fewer than 29 were returned and formed an independent group. The election of December 1910 increased the membership of the Group to 42, and that of 1923 to 191. The Conservatives still remained the largest Party (259) in the House, but the Liberals—temporarily reconciled and uneasily reunited—returned 158 strong. A combination between the latter and the Socialists could, therefore, turn the Tories out. Mr Asquith decided to effect it, and Mr MacDonald became Prime Minister, at the head of a Socialist Ministry. But, though in office, he was never in power; he held his office only on Liberal sufferance, and after nine months the Liberals combined with the Conservatives to turn him out. The ensuing election returned 413 Conservatives and 151 Socialists. Mr Asquith with all his leading

---

\* Cf. Lecky, 'Democracy and Liberty,' vol. II, p. 18. Mr Gladstone agreed with Lecky.

colleagues disappeared, and his Party was annihilated. In the new House the Liberals could count only 40 members, having lost no fewer than 115 seats. The Socialists were recognised as 'His Majesty's Opposition.'

The annihilation of the Liberal Party was nothing short of a national disaster. In 1929 they were able to raise their Parliamentary representation to 59, but the Labour Party, outnumbering the Conservatives by 28, were the largest single Party in the new House, and again took office as a Minority Government. They could not, however, stand up against the economic blizzard which swept through the world in 1930-1, and in August 1931 Mr MacDonald resigned office, only to resume it again as the head of a National Government. An appeal to the electorate resulted in the return of no fewer than 554 to support that Government. The Opposition Socialists lost nearly all their leaders, and could count only 52 members; the leaderless Liberals numbered less than a baker's dozen. Another election in 1935 reduced the ministerial majority to 247; the Conservatives contributing 357 out of the 431 members returned to support the Government. The Liberal Opposition numbers 21: Mr Attlee has 154 regular supporters.

What of the future? No detached observer can regard the present Parliamentary situation with any degree of satisfaction. Sooner or later, the Government will ask for the renewal of a mandate to a Party which unquestionably includes, with a very few isolated exceptions, the most eminent and the most experienced members of all Parties, and claims, alike by reason of its composition and its policy, to be 'national.' It is no part of my immediate purpose to discuss the validity of that claim. A life-long Conservative must needs give whole-hearted support to a Government which commands the allegiance of nearly all Conservatives, as well as that of many Liberals, and which has unquestionably done more (while refraining from a Socialist reconstruction of the social and economic fabric) to promote social reform than any previous administration in this country. For we cannot disguise the truth that the impulse which has produced, in other countries, the Totalitarian State has had a powerful repercussion upon our own.

The tendency in recent years has all been in the direction of State control and centralisation. It is not true that the capitalistic organisation of industry has completely broken down; individual thrift continuing to fill the reservoirs whence industry or trade draw their fertilising streams, it opens up new sources of wealth, nor was the superior ability of the individual entrepreneur ever more essential to the successful conduct of business than it is to-day. Nevertheless industry after industry has appealed to the State, in accents that would have horrified the captains of industry in the last generation, to save it from ruin, and the State has responded with subsidies obtained by taxation imposed upon industries that still continue to stand on their own feet. Semi-public corporations invested by the State with monopolistic privileges have, in several instances, ousted competition and private enterprise, and in the sphere of transport and distribution have attained important dimensions. The totalitarian principle has not yet captured the political machine: but the words of a recent writer may well strike a note of warning if not of alarm. In a singularly thoughtful essay Mr Christopher Dawson says:

'The existing totalitarian régimes have all originated in the same manner: viz. by the capture of the State machine by a political Party which has then proceeded to organise the whole life of the community according to its programme and ideology. . . . Fascism and Communism owed their triumph to a policy of revolutionary action which restored to the State a single will and purpose. But in order to do this they narrowed the basis of citizenship at the same time as they widened the range of political action. Alike to the Communist and the National Socialist the community transcends the State, and the Party is not a cog in the machinery of government, but the inspired organ of the community or the nation; and it possesses a divine absolute right to override legal and constitutional restrictions and to use the State as a means of realising its super-political ideals. For the State exists only to serve the people; and the Party, or the leader of the Party, is the only authentic embodiment of the will of the people.'\*

It is not suggested that there is any imminent danger of a similar development in this country. But the danger

---

\* 'Beyond Politics, pp. 8-9.

might well emerge were the Party system to be permanently eliminated from the Parliamentary machine. More than that : it is in the highest degree desirable, if not imperative, that we should, as soon as may be, revert to the *two-Party* system. That system, as a distinguished Hungarian publicist has lately pointed out, is integral in our games as in our politics :

' La politique est le jeu pacifique de deux partis. . . . Le jeu dans le sport est toujours une lutte de deux camps : dans la politique également, l'anglais tient au système des deux partis, tout le régime électoral anglais est organisé dans cet esprit. L'anglais est habitué, sur le terrain de sport, à ne voir que deux couleurs : le bleu marin d'Oxford, et le bleu ciel de Cambridge. Il ne sent le rythme de la vie politique que dans la lutte de deux partis. L'apparition d'un troisième parti le déconcerte : voilà ce qui explique l'élimination progressive du parti libéral de l'arène politique anglaise. La collaboration du parti gouvernemental et de l'opposition de Sa Majesté dans l'intérêt de l'Etat . . . est la principale caractéristique du parlementarisme anglais.' \*

The point could not be made more clearly or more picturesquely. It hardly needs to be reinforced by an appeal to two of the most eminent of parliamentary gladiators. Disraeli and Gladstone were equally emphatic in asserting that to the health of Parliamentary Government a strong Opposition was not less essential than a strong Ministry. For this, among other reasons : Parliamentary Democracy can work effectively only if the Opposition can supply an alternative administration. Consequently it is of the highest importance that, by some means or other, the Opposition should be so reformed as to present a united front in Parliament, and should be reinforced, to a reasonable extent, in numbers, and still more in quality. At present, owing to circumstances which Conservatives may sincerely regret, each wing of the Opposition is lamentably deficient in both respects. A sense of responsibility, even in criticism, can hardly be expected of men who have neither experience of high office in the past nor expectation of it in the immediate future.

It is easier to diagnose this constitutional weakness

---

\* 'L'Homme d'État,' par Jules Kornis, p. 490.

than to prescribe a remedy. At the moment it is, of course, largely a matter of personnel, and when we deal with personnel it is difficult to reconcile candour with charity. In debate the Labour Party would seem to rely overmuch on a small group of academically-trained *intelligentsia*, to whom the House is inclined to listen much less sympathetically than to the Trade Union representatives who speak, more rarely, but with the first-hand knowledge that always commands respect, on industrial questions. That there is a plentitude of brains in the ranks of manual labour the Trade Union and Co-operative Movements prove. But success in the parliamentary game demands something more than good brains. It demands something more than superficial knowledge of current questions, abundant assurance, and a glib tongue. Catch-words may suffice for interruptions but are hardly calculated to sustain debate. Accordingly when it comes to debates on foreign or Imperial questions the existing oppositions are hopelessly over-weighted, while Ministerial speakers, being insufficiently extended, do not, except in rare cases, rise above mediocrity. The broad result is a painful deterioration in the art of parliamentary debate. To those who recall the flashing rapiers displayed in the duels between Asquith and Balfour, between Carson and Tim Healy, still more to the few who can remember the debates on the Home Rule Bill—the majestic eloquence of Gladstone on the one side, and Bright on the other, the brilliant debating of Chamberlain, Goschen, and Harcourt, the ingenuity and skill with which, night after night, week after week in committee Gladstone defended the clauses of his Bill—the falling off is deplorable. Something must, of course, be attributed to the completely changed fashion in parliamentary speaking; rhetoric is out of date; many speeches in defiance of rules are read; dialectic is a forgotten art. But the deterioration is more directly due to the marked inequality between the contending forces.

Thus we come back to the main thesis submitted in this paper—the indispensability of the Party system to the efficient working of Parliamentary Democracy. Democracies—even in the modern world—are, be it observed, of different types. The Referendal Democracy of Switzerland differs as widely from the Presidential



Democracy of the United States as do both from the Monarchical Parliamentary Democracy of England. The essential differentia of the English type is that it is a primary function of the Legislature to sustain, to criticise, or to displace the Executive as circumstances may require.

These observations are the commonplace of all commentators on the English Constitution. This may not seem to be the appropriate moment for insisting upon them. *Inter arma silent leges.* As a fact the Laws never spoke more loudly : never was Parliament more active in legislation than in the first days of September of this year. But, evidently, at a moment like the present the part played by the Executive is incomparably more important than that of the Legislature. Hence the paradox to which on September 3 Mr Churchill drew attention—the surrender of our own jealously guarded rights and liberties at the moment when we are plunging into a war undertaken to secure them to other peoples. 'In these last few days,' he said, 'the House of Commons has been voting dozens of Bills which hand over to the Executive our most dearly valued traditional liberties.' But as he finely added : 'We look forward to the day—surely and confidently we look forward to the day—when our liberties and rights will be restored to us and when we shall be able to share them with the peoples to whom such blessings are unknown.'

The surrender of liberties is, we trust, no more than temporary. We must look at the earliest possible moment to the resumption of rights and liberties. Even during the interval the surrender is not irrevocable. Parliament remains sovereign, and the war will consequently afford a crucial test of two directly opposed forms of government, Parliamentary Democracy and Military Dictatorship. For the waging of war the latter possesses certain obvious advantages on which it were superfluous to dwell. But apart from purely military advantages it were folly to underestimate the strength which the German Reich derives from the identification, even if incomplete, of Church and State. An immense accretion of strength, spiritual no less than military, must be imparted to a State which can thus command the religious devotion as well as the political allegiance of its citizens. Its soldiers fight as crusaders

under a leader who, in his single person, combines the attributes of Supreme Ruler, High Priest, and Generalissimo. From this unhappy conflict the Democracies can emerge victorious only if they oppose principle to principle, only if the Faith that sustains them is as deeply rooted and as firmly held as that of their enemies.

If the thesis of this paper be valid, if the vitality of Parliamentary Democracy really depends upon Party organisation, it would appear superficially that all the advantage is on the side of the enemy. Unity is opposed to division; a nation possessing the close-knit attributes of a Church is at war with a people whose secular policy rests on the perpetuation of internal conflicts! The antithesis is, however, misleading; the antagonism of organisations is superficial. The Totalitarian State, no less than the Democratic State, is, in the last analysis, a form of government. Stripped of the factitious accretions of pageantry and ritual it is revealed as political machinery. Nazis and Fascists no less than Whigs and Tories are Parties, but while the latter are based on free choice and individual preference, the former depend for their apparent unanimity and coherence upon force. Admittedly the Nazis represent the great majority of the German people; they owe allegiance and gratitude to a leader who, whatever his faults, has led them out of the wilderness of humiliation and anarchy. Yet national unity is in reality no more complete under the Dictatorships than under the Democracies. Enthusiastic majorities may acclaim the Führer, but there are minorities who are reduced to silence and to obedience by force, and by force only are restrained from revolt.

The 'bogey' of Party need not, then, alarm us. Nay, Party divisions, frankly avowed, zealously if discreetly maintained, may actually contribute to a unity which is the stronger because it is not mechanical but spiritual.

Of that spiritual unity, a unity that extends to the Empire as a whole, the Crown is the symbol. But the King is a good deal more than a symbol. He is a political force, binding together the scattered units of the Empire. In mid-Victorian days Walter Bagehot attributed much of the strength of the British monarchy to the 'mystery' which encompassed the Throne and its occupant. The mystery has been in great measure dispersed, but without

any loss of dignity and with a great access of political importance. The British type of Democracy is not only Parliamentary but Monarchical. From Party politics, in the narrower sense, the Sovereign stands entirely aloof. In politics, in the larger sense, the importance of the Crown is steadily increasing, more particularly in one vast domain of our public affairs. 'The importance of the Crown in our Constitution is not a diminishing but an increasing factor. It increases and must increase with the development of those free self-governing communities beyond the sea who are constitutionally linked to us through the person of the Sovereign, the living symbol of Imperial Unity.' So said Mr Balfour in 1901. His shrewd prediction has been fulfilled. He himself helped to fulfil it when he drafted the famous Report of the Imperial Conference of 1926. 'The Crown is the symbol of the free association of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations . . . they are united by common allegiance to the Crown.' So runs the Preamble to the Statute of Westminster. That Statute echoes the language not only of Lord Balfour but of General Smuts: 'You cannot,' said the latter in 1917, 'make a republic of the British Commonwealth of Nations.' In each member of that Commonwealth the principle of Party Government is recognised as essential to the working of Parliamentary Democracy. The Commonwealth, not to add the larger Empire of which it forms part, is held in being by the Crown. Parliamentary Democracy connotes the Party system: of the associated and co-operating Democracies the Crown is the symbol and the apex. Dictatorships endure but for a season: they depend on the life of individuals. Democracies which are at once Parliamentary and Monarchical could be destroyed only if Parliament were to decay, only if violent hands were laid upon the Throne.

J. A. R. MARRIOTT.

## Art. 12.—THE CALL.

At eleven o'clock in the morning of Sunday, September 3, the Government of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared war on Germany, in fulfilment of the pledge given to Poland, with the equal determination of France, that if Herr Hitler and his Nazi Government in their sudden claims to the Corridor and the Free City of Danzig continued against her the practices which had resulted in the violent absorption into German territory of Austria, Bohemia, and Moravia, then force would be answered by force. The issue was terse and definite.

In loyal co-operation with the Mother Country, the Dominions and other members of the British Commonwealth, with the Empire in India, subsequently also either declared war on Germany or expressed the closest sympathy with Great Britain and France in the action they had taken for the great and essential cause at issue. Eire, with the sad perversity that has always animated Irish politics in relation to England, alone of the Dominions declared herself neutral; but it is known that among the mass of her people sympathy with Poland and indignation with the Nazi Government of Germany are as eager and frankly expressed as in every other free democracy.

In spite of numerous appeals to reason and continuous efforts at negotiation made with endless patience by the British Government, the Nazi rulers of Germany did seize Danzig and invade Poland without even a declaration of war, on the plea that their terms had been rejected, although in fact there had been no terms, but only a sort of ultimatum to the Poles. Nor had the terms been revealed to our Government or to France, but were only given to the Polish Ambassador in Berlin at 8 p.m., and two hours later were broadcast over the German wireless system with the remark that the Nazi Government regarded them as having been rejected.

Early in the following morning the invasion of Poland began. So sudden was the attack that the Poles were engaged in defensive fighting for fifty-four hours before the Allies were able to complete the formalities before declaring war. During that critical period, however, even another effort was made by the British Government to bring a pause to the fighting so that one more attempt

towards securing an honourable end with peace through negotiations might be made.

That appeal and offer were ignored by Adolf Hitler—whose war this is—until, the time-limit having expired, he abruptly refused them.

Once again, therefore, the charnel-house is opened and the horrors let loose, and many gallant lives, innocent, hopeful lives, on both sides of the conflict will be spent to feed the senseless, criminal ambition of that one man who with a ruthless drilled minority behind him—for assuredly the best, and the majority, of Germans are not in heart with him in this struggle and its causes, but have been cowed into acquiescence by the oppressions of his dictatorship—sees himself as a new Napoleon, destined through sharp conquest to establish the material power of the Reich.

The great Napoleon had great faults. He could practise cruelties and duplicities and could tyrannise; he had no care for the lives of his soldiers, who existed to serve his purposes, but he was built on a scale far finer than the maker of this war. He had genius, loyalty to his friends—generally more so than they had to him—and a blunt soldier's humour; and although his claims to glory and dominion were selfish, dangerous, and futile as he followed the phantasmic star which misled him—to Moscow, to Elba, to Waterloo—he still showed aspects of greatness when fallen and confined to the insularities of St. Helena.

The moral of this, in its application to the present war, is clear; and the 'Quarterly' is entitled to take note of it, as, established one hundred and thirty years ago, its record stretches without interruption back to the days when the power and influence of Napoleon were at their highest and the star that lured him on to the ultimate downfall still shone to him brilliantly with its deceitful fire.

And it is appropriate here to note that since 1809, beginning with the Peninsular War, there have been no less than thirteen international conflicts in Europe: the Greek War of Independence, for which Byron died; the Crimean; the war of Italy with Austria, which established the Risorgimento; the Prussian wars against Denmark and against Austria; the Franco-Prussian War; the war between Russia and Turkey in the 'seventies; the 'one

Hundred Days War ' between Greece and Turkey in 1895 ; the first and the second Balkan Wars ; the Great War ; and now Hitler's. Of these thirteen no less than five were directly due to German aggression, and all of them the ' Quarterly ' has witnessed and commented on.

The year 1809 saw the faint beginnings of Napoleon's change of fortune. On its first day he left Spain, with Soult in command of his forces there and Moore on the immortal retreat to Corunna. At that hour the Emperor could leave the Peninsula with confidence that his luck still held—for Austria and Prussia were crushed ; he had interfered effectually in Spain, had put his brother Joseph on the throne there, and was meditating an assault on Portugal ; while he dominated Italy and had made peace with Russia. But the clouds were gathering, though not at once to obliterate the star. Yet still the skies darkened ; and within four years of his return from Spain he was forced to make his famous retreat from Moscow ; and so took the bitter road to disaster and the foretaste of final ruin.

It is with no hesitations, therefore, that, in spite of the heavy issues, the ' Quarterly ' is able to contemplate a right end to these present dangers and the eventual downfall of this lesser man, who, having rejected all the ideals of the spirit, looks to force and the crude, conscienceless trickeries and shallow reasonings, duplicities and not diplomacy, that have marked all his efforts to fulfil his purposes and re-establish Germany on its old harsh foundations. ' Blood and iron ' is again the motto of the unhappy people ; but its spirit needs the Bismarckian touch. It lacks now the assured efficiency in diplomatic methods and warlike possibilities and deeds ; while even the limited ideologies—to use what is at present a vastly over-laboured word—which animated the German Empire that was established at Versailles in 1871 are wanting in the political adventurers who have been the recent masters of the Reich.

Even their sudden deal with Russia, slick and devastating as it was, may prove a cleverness too much ; for, as the Great War showed, the Bolsheviks are astute propagandists and with such as the Germans, rank and file, closely herded and fed with shibboleths, are able to make easy converts to their red gospel. This perhaps is



too uncertain a conjecture, but many helpful things, including that which was paralleled in the Great War, are possible.

It is not in any mere spirit of partisan contempt that we contemplate those builders of the present evil—Herr Hitler, Field-Marshal Goering, Herr von Ribbentrop, Dr Goebbels, Herr Hess, and their intimates, associates, and similarities, who, in sinister union together, have debased the old Indian symbol of the Swastika—but simply to realise their heavy guilt in political crime and to re-emphasise the truth that they do not represent more than a drilled minority of the German people.

Until Hitler was able to use organised force at home and suppress all opposition to himself and his materialistic creed he never had a majority ; and in the stress of warfare it is to be hoped that we shall remember the truth that indirectly it is for the happier freedom of the mass of the German people as well as for the ultimate liberty of Poland and the other States, overcome or threatened by the Nazi clique, that Great Britain and France are fighting.

Hitler's has been a long-sustained and dark conspiracy, blotted and smeared with blood, not only against certain free foreign peoples but against Germans too. Its records are involved and yet overwhelmingly clear. There was the persecution of the Churches, Roman Catholic and Protestant, with Pastor Niemöller, who had been the captain of a submarine in the Great War, still and for more than a year kept, without judgment against him, in almost solitary confinement, and merely because in loyalty to his creed he would not bow the knee to Hitler's pagan idol of deified force. There was also the pitiless ill-treatment of the Jews, often so wanton that sometimes officers of the German Army, worthy of their discipline, intervened to shield the helpless in the face of their Nazi assailants ; with those crimes against the very principles of liberty, the forcible bringing into the Reich of nationalities which had belonged to the former Austrian Empire.

The Anschluss was a possibility that, it was recognised, time and peaceful methods might have brought about, for there was no ill-will among the Powers in Europe towards the righting through natural processes and a spirit of

give-and-take of irregularities in the relative positions of States or of the post-war treaties. But that was too smooth and protracted a method for Herr Hitler, who already had tried his game successfully with the surprise seizure of the Rhine borderland.

He wanted something more spectacular, more forceful, something to impress Europe with his power and smart efficiency; so, defeating the attempt at a plebiscite arranged by Dr Schuschnigg, he rushed a plebiscite of his own and by using all the influence of militant force and exploiting German patriotism, which had not yet found him out, secured his end. Then, having attached Austria to the Grosser Reich, he oppressed the minority who had opposed him with the sternness and mercilessness of revenge that too often have marked a German victory over weakness.

To this day Dr Schuschnigg has been illegally kept in confinement so close that the outer world has no knowledge of how it is with him, or whether or not he suffered any trial for having championed the freedom of his own people, or of what his future prospects may be. Hitler remains his gaoler, stubborn and remorseless. To discover a parallel to such treatment of a political opponent, formerly the head of a free and friendly State, historians would need to go back to the records of the darkest ages—to those ages of ignorance, persecution, and inquisitorial tyranny which the Nazis in their activities appear wishful to restore.

Earlier than that outrage was the worse one committed by the same cruel clique; the calculated pitiless murder of Dr Dolfuss, one of the most loved and courageous statesmen in Europe, who, when stricken down, was left to die slowly in agony and prevented from securing the help before death of a doctor or the consolations given by a priest. It was a crime which marks the black treachery and barbarities of a most evil régime, yet in Germany the individual murderers of Dolfuss are belauded by the Nazis as heroes and martyrs! How can a cause prosper that sets itself so blatantly against the sweetness of divine pity?

In Czecho-Slovakia the old tricks improved upon were used again. The happiest excuse for Nazi intervention is through the widespread claims, which of course must be

repaid, of cruelties suffered by Germans settled in the countries that are coveted. If there were cruelties suffered—a large and doubtful If—their character was certainly exaggerated; while often they were done in retaliation for equal ills, though mostly they were invented to provide excuses for the profitable violence of revenge. It is irony of a Mephistophelian simplicity, too smally cunning to be Satanic—but it serves!

The Sudeten Germans settled in Bohemia were suddenly discovered to be suffering oppression and atrocities, and because the trick was not yet detected a number of good people elsewhere believed the assertion was true and were led to think that the Czechs were intolerant and cruel. Now, having learnt from the history of our own times, we know that even if the Czechs had been the wolves pictured by their carefully indignant opponents, those Sudeten Germans were not haloed lambs.

But it is easy to be comparatively wise after the event; especially when the same device has been worked again; for Hitler had his way. His doctored indignation came to the promised boiling-point, and we awoke one morning to find Bohemia, in spite of pledges given and perorations heavy with professions of good faith and peaceful intentions, removed from the map and joined to the Greater Germany, with Slovakia as a protectorate and the Czechs left, deserted, sacrificed, and embittered, while the rest of the world that still was free from the virus of dictatorial tyranny was left wondering, troubled, and ashamed.

The tragedy of Czecho-Slovakia was also the dress-rehearsal to the attempt on Poland, which, with all the agonies and death to be suffered while the war lasts, will, in our confident faith, not end in the same sad way. Similar processes as prevailed then were tried again. Charges were persistently trumped up by Herr Hitler and his inspired propagandist, Dr Goebbels, of outrages and atrocities committed by the Poles against Germans and of frontier incidents of assured unreliability; with the result that the democracies of Europe and the whole world, though convinced that the accusations made were untrue, were kept in a constant state of tense anxiety before the threat of a new and terrible war. That condition grew worse and critical as it became known that the City of Danzig was being rapidly garrisoned with Nazi

fighters who were occupied in making and strengthening fortifications in the Free territory for themselves.

Throughout that period of increasing strain the Poles remained studiously careful—and this is the absolute truth—not to commit any offence that might give the excuse for war; but also they were determined not to yield Danzig or the Corridor or any treaty right to Nazi pressure, though always they were frankly willing to refer the issue between them and Germany to the decision of a separate, qualified, and just tribunal. Throughout those weeks of stress it is absolutely true to say that the conduct of Poland was patient, dignified, and clean. But all efforts and appeals for peace—those made by the Pope and by President Roosevelt, as well as by our Government—fell on obstinate ears and failed, and we are at war.

The processes that led to, or could not prevent, the conflict have been simply and plainly set down here, because in the confusions of modern warfare, which is fought with tongues and pens as well as with swords and bombs, the historical facts and justifications may soon be lost sight of. But this is assured and comforting. Never was our people, or indeed the whole of the British Commonwealth of Nations, more thoroughly united than in this great cause. Party differences have vanished before the duty and necessity of fighting to preserve the sacred principles of freedom. The spirit prevailing in these islands when war broke out was most serious, earnest, yet cheerful, and free from the wild excitement which had welcomed the outbreak of 1914. It was like the opening of a crusade.

There have been no doubts among the populace as to the rights of it or of the ultimate results, and no shirking of the truth that the way to that end will be anxious and will bring griefs and disappointments. But the eventual victory is certain.

For the cause is spiritual and right is on our side. The powers of evil are ranged against those essential human rights which cannot and shall not be surrendered. Any other result but victory would be preposterous, impossible: for defeat would mean that religion was proved futile and civilisation a mockery; and the stars would go out.

## SOME RECENT BOOKS.

- The Medieval Library.** James Westfall Thompson.
- Alexandre Dumas Père and Spanish Romantic Drama.** John A. Thompson.
- The Defence of Britain.** B. H. Liddell Hart.
- Modern Constitutions since 1787.** John A. Hawgood.
- England's Water Problem.** H. Spence-Sales and John Bland.
- The Quiet World of Nature.** Bernard Gooch.
- The Insect Legion.** Malcolm Burr.
- Best-Sellers : Are they Born or Made?** George Stevens and Stanley Unwin.
- A Post in Parliament.** Derek Hudson.
- Samuel Pepys, III.** Arthur Bryant.
- Walter Bagehot.** William Irvine.
- Memoirs.** Mrs Woodrow Wilson.
- Torquemada.** Thomas Hope.
- The Origins of the Reformation.** James Mackinnon.
- Man in Revolt.** Emil Brunner.
- The Mystery of the Fate of the Ark of the Covenant.** Cyril C. Dobson.
- Sexual Freedom.** René Guyon.
- In Praise of Comedy.** James Feibleman.
- The Back Garden of Allah.** C. S. Jarvis.

WE have enjoyed many opportunities for paying tributes to American scholars for their devotion in their studies and for the results attained, especially in the less visited provinces of research : and once again that is our privilege. No work surely can better deserve gratitude than the handsomely produced volume on 'The Medieval Library' (Cambridge University Press : University of Chicago Press) which has come from the industry of Professor James Westfall Thompson, of California, and the group of his associates who share his cultural gifts. In tracing the history of the Library until the invention of printing changed its character, these scholars have gone back to ancient Greece and Rome, and continued to the coming of the *incunabula*. Into that vast period infinite details of information are packed ; with the result that the reader is impressed by the mass of reading and eager collection of MSS. that went on in medieval times ; by the wide range of scholarly interest then, though, doubtless, the eternal charlatan often intervened ; and the unalterable methods by which books, then as now, were begged, borrowed, and not returned. The character of libraries belonging to kings, popes, and monastic establishments, listed and described in detail, reveal not only the large scope, if not of learning, yet of the interest taken by scholars in law, rhetoric, theology, astronomy, the classics, and much else. Our authors shed light on the scriptoria

and the diligence of medieval scribes, which not always came from religious devotion and the desire to spread knowledge, but often from the hard rule of the monastery task-master, intent on occupying idle hours, hands, and minds. A monk of one house who failed to keep his copy and the original clean was subject to a penance of many prostrations; if he read the text carelessly it was bread and water for three days; if in his transcription he wandered from the original, the penalty was three days exclusion from the community. It is also made clear how much precious literature was lost through fires. This work is apt and thorough. It does honour to American scholarship and book-craft. We wish that we could speak with the same full admiration of Professor John A. Thompson's revised thesis on '**Alexandre Dumas Père and Spanish Romantic Drama**' (Louisiana State University Press), and can indeed praise the industry and care that has gone to it. But is the subject worth the trouble that he has given? It is good sometimes to wander, as often American research does, taking us down byways rarely traversed; but the literary relations of the elder Dumas with Spanish Romanticism seem almost to belong to Laputa and do not make call enough.

Captain Liddell Hart's books are always thought-provoking and sometimes the stress is on the adjective. This may be said of his latest work, '**The Defence of Britain**' (Faber), which deals with subjects ranging from the future of Europe to the early training of the individual soldier. The state of Europe can, of course, be treated on strategical or political lines, and what is desirable from one point of view may be impossible from the other. The statesman can pursue neither of these lines wholeheartedly (unless luckily for him they coincide); therefore he may find himself criticised from both sides. Captain Liddell Hart can hardly claim to be as great an expert politically as he is strategically, nor in his condemnation of the Munich agreement of last year does he enlighten us as to what he would have done under the same circumstances. It would be advantageous also if he had defined more exactly the scope of 'collective security.' All the same, his consideration of the forces and dangers of Europe is clear and striking. When it comes to the reorganisation and training of our armies, his publishers are perhaps hardly



fair to him in printing their note which claims that all is considered in the light of 'in what respects the reforms introduced accord with or fall short of his advice.' Surely that sets him up as a supreme authority and final court of appeal—a position which he would hardly claim, however valuable his advice has been, and under existing war conditions may be. No one would wish to dispute his authority in matters of training and the strong case which he makes out for his ideas. Of training he has had useful personal experience, which, however, as it has never been his lot to hold high command within the military machine, cannot be said of his views on high strategy, though it may be that as the onlooker, who is also a thinker and a clear-headed critic, he may see most of the game. Some authorities will dispute his convictions as to the superiority of defence over attack, but no such authority can afford to overlook so able a work as this, and time is now likely to prove, or disprove, emphatically his calculations.

Constitution-making is generally a fascinating pastime to political thinkers and there has been ample opportunity for its practice since the Great War; with the added interest of seeing how some of the shifts the statesmen made after the Peace have borne the tests of bad weather. Dr John A. Hawgood has set down in lucid black-and-white, and usefully, his studies of 'Modern Constitutions since 1787' (Macmillan). He shows not only how widely developed the character of those constitutions has been, but how constant, even though normally slow, is the drift towards changes, as the ideas of peoples develop and other states grow ambitious. So comprehensive is the variety of the present constitutions in Europe, from the Communism of Russia to the Fascist régimes of Italy and Germany—with the democracies of Great Britain, France, Switzerland, and the Scandinavian countries representing, as we hope, the happy mean—that it is not surprising to find that when Aristotle set himself to study the governments of that small but decidedly individual part of the world known as ancient Greece he discovered no less than one hundred and fifty-eight different constitutions from which to draw his conclusions. The state of Europe since its post-Revolutionary conditions, and at the earlier stages through the Napoleonic

upset, has been feverish ; with kingdoms and republics set up and overturned, great combinations like those of the German Empire and the united Italy gathering into one armed fold their constituent duchies and principedoms ; and, still as a happy compromise, Great Britain steadfast through her Parliamentary system and unwritten constitution of reasonable compromise.

Messrs H. Spence-Sales and John Bland have drawn timely attention to a question of some considerable importance to our country through their Survey, written in collaboration, of its rainfall, droughts, and distribution, entitled '**England's Water Problem**' (Country Life). It is a subject on which much serious thought has been spent, since floods and droughts seemed more frequently to happen, though that impression might have been due to the greater attention given to them in the newspapers. Already through the Rivers Pollution Act of 1876 and other legislation steps had been taken to end or mend a too widely spread want and mischief. Those who, fortunately or otherwise, can recall the condition of the Thames, with its floating filth, half a century ago, will realise the many improvements at work for the disposal of sewage, with a thousand other improvements made for the better provision, preservation, and control of water supply. Yet much remains to be done, as this reasonable book shows ; and the question must be faced and dealt with by individuals, as well as by local authorities and Parliament. More water is needed for general use as the standard of living has risen, and agriculture, with its requirements for the soil and cleanliness in stables and byres, must have a regular flow available. There are wider aspects still of this national question, with difficulties over storage and distribution and the prevention of floods to be overcome.

The publishers' note on '**The Quiet World of Nature**' by Bernard Gooch (Lane), says that in these days of international strife and chaos it is a relief to turn one's mind for a little while away from the world of men to the quiet world of nature. That is true, and after too much Hitler we can delight in the adventures of Herbert the Herring Gull or the life-story of Sally the Salamander. Readers may not agree with the author over the pleasure of having poisonous vipers curling round their necks or exploring the interiors of their

ears ; but vicariously they can fully enjoy the study of birds, beasts, and insects in their native haunts, visiting the home of the buzzard or finding the immense amount of absorbing life there is even in a small garden pool. Lizards, snakes, voles, foxes, bats, stoats, robins, kestrels, chaffinches all contribute their quota to this fascinating book, written with the expert knowledge, experience, and sympathy of a true nature-lover.

Few writers of scientific intention are so well-suited to their particular tasks as is Dr Malcolm Burr with '**The Insect Legion**' (Nisbet). Not only has he the special knowledge that his subject requires—the familiarity that breeds admiration—but he possesses also a sense of the romance of it in large measure gained through years of travel in countries where the devoted entomologist can find his happiest hunting-grounds. The result on this occasion is a work racily written, full of reality, and attractively instructive. To Dr Burr the insect is, and in fact it is, a creature of deep importance to the world. It is greatly destructive here and beneficial there ; the cause of diseases widespread and terrible ; yet sometimes it produces good. Multifarious in its effects, good and bad, Dr Burr has been indefatigable in setting down the results of his and of other's investigations. Not only has he been able to show, and prove, that insects have decimated armies and contributed more than any other single factor to the growth of the organisation for nursing the sick, but he is able to throw light on the character of the plagues that Pharaoh suffered, on the manna which saved the wandering Israelites in Arabia, and on the methods of the miracle-working Moses. The trouble is that no brief review of this comprehensive work can fully describe it. That being so, the best thing is to get and read it.

Every publisher must wish fervently that all his authors should read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest Messrs. George Stevens and Stanley Unwin's '**Best-Sellers : Are they Born or Made ?**' (Allen and Unwin) for they would learn much that they should know from that excellent little volume. Quite apart from authors, anyone interested in the psychological and material results of advertising can read it with profit. The first and third portions of the book, by Mr Unwin and Mr Frank Swinnerton, deal with England ; while the centre

portion, by Mr George Stevens, deals with America. All of them come to the definite conclusion that the display advertising alone will never make a 'best-seller.' To use a metaphor, such advertising may put a car which is running well in third speed up to top, but it will not get it out of second unless there is other power behind. No publisher in this country speaks with greater authority and more intimate knowledge than Mr Unwin, and the hard facts which he gives from experience should go far to convince even the more obstinate believers in the 'large advertisement in the Sunday papers means many editions' fallacy. Beyond the consideration of advertisements there is much in these pages concerning the life-history of a book that will reward any reader.

His purpose in writing the life of Winthrop Mackworth Praed, who was 'A Poet in Parliament' (Murray), Mr Derek Hudson informs us, was to disclose something of a personality which has hitherto remained obscure. It was a good purpose happily realised, for Praed was a personality, 'the Watteau of English poetry,' of such richness that the forgetfulness which followed his death a century ago has been an injustice to him as well as to posterity. His gifts for light verse were first-rate; witty, truthful, graceful. They read as freshly as when they were penned; except, of course, that Time has blunted the point of some of the allusions. But also his work in Parliament was notable in an eager political age. A follower of Peel, he soon attained a minor post in the Government and was actually thought of as in the running for the leadership of the House. As Mr Hudson points out, his achievements in Parliament would surely have led him to high office if his physical stamina had been sufficient. It is his verse and personality that most attract. He had a charm that persists, with evidently flashes of temper which possibly improved the charm; while much of his light poetry deserves to be remembered. Here are lines, wisely suppressed, from a published satire on George IV, a mock elegy written before that king's death:—

'A noble, nasty race he ran,  
Superbly filthy and fastidious;  
He was the world's first gentleman,  
And made the appellation hideous.'

With the third volume of his biography of 'Samuel Pepys' (Cambridge University Press) Mr Arthur Bryant brings us to the most important period of the great little man's career. In earlier instalments we have seen him in the making and during the years of his peril and personal defeat: we accompany him now through the six years which proved him to be the saviour of the Navy, re-establishing its pride and conditions after the appalling neglect it had suffered through the incompetence of his rivals and enemies. Ships were rotten through and liable to founder at their moorings. To restore them and make them a vital fighting force, manned by sailors who were proud of the Navy, was an achievement which, we are confident, only Pepys's genius for administration and decisiveness could have accomplished. It is a fine story of practical patriotic effort, fascinating to read, as Mr Bryant treats it; beginning with the romantic episode of the dismantling of Tangier by Lord Dartmouth, with the holiday glimpses of Spain that Pepys enjoyed; and after continuing with an account of his administrative work under the favour of Charles II and James, whose short-sightedness cost him the Crown, comes to the invasion by William of Orange, helped by a Protestant wind, and the ultimate eclipse of Pepys, with his work as a builder and restorer of the British Navy done. Mr Bryant possesses the qualities of an excellent biographer, and with the sympathetic figure of his very human Samuel he proves it.

'Walter Bagehot' (Longmans), whose economic and other works, forty or so years ago, were often quoted as authoritative, seems to have become generally forgotten; although Professor William Irvine, who has written this study of his career and views, reminds us that 'Lombard Street,' with such revisions as its own influence have brought about, is still a successful text-book. Those who had some acquaintance with Bagehot's works in days ago will be interested in this attractive analysis of his thoughts and opinions on persons and interests which covered wide ranges. Bagehot was one of thosefortunates who possibly would have done more and more enduringly if they had not been so fortunate; for he had no financial cares, no anxieties for the morrow; he was born or he married into prosperous conditions, was a banker, an economist, a politician, who failed in his attempts to enter

Parliament, and was happy in using his well-furnished and critical mind also on question of literature and religion. So that in work and leisure alike he was well employed, and yet he has not achieved or retained the place that years ago was expected of him. Professor Irvine shows why he missed. He lacked the quality or spark of individuality which is essential to greatness, and he was not great. Like Leslie Stephen, he served his time well, interpreting its passing concerns soundly and clearly—but afterwards? This book in any case stimulates to helpful thought.

Mrs Woodrow Wilson genially protests that her 'Memoirs' (Putnam) is not a formal book. As, indeed, it is not, for at times it is quite incautious in the personal judgments expressed, but yet it is sincere and certainly entertaining. Through her pride and affection for her husband, the President, she makes an excellent defence of his political ideals and especially for that greatest of them, the League of Nations, by showing how bitterly he felt, first, when Colonel House, an over-rated politician, left to negotiate in Europe, compromised fatally, and afterwards when the Senate at Washington refused to ratify the Treaty. Woodrow Wilson, as revealed here and as doubtless he was, was clearly a man of ideals too far-reaching for his political times and associates, but blessed with a gift for common sense and will-power—and to notice his powerful jaws was to realise that—which might still have won his fight for the immeasurable benefit of our stricken Europe if he had not fallen to the paralytic stroke which put him out. Mrs Wilson writes brightly, with a pricking pen, of people she met, and is especially interesting in her account of the President's and her visit to Buckingham Palace after the War. Her pages have many inaccuracies; as of the Lord Mayor of Dover and royal servants having bear-grease on their wigs; while her judgments of the late Queen of Rumania with her gushing and ineffectual sweetness, of Mr Lloyd George and the Mrs Asquith of that time are incisive. Lady Oxford, however, has since repudiated the aspersions made. Amongst other bright things we are told that she 'smoked one cigarette after another, striking the matches as I have seen certain men do, on their own anatomy.' Can that last word be right?



The Holy Inquisition, that monstrous expression of remorselessness and intolerance, has invariably fascinated the curious through its forms, mysteries, and terrors, its ruthlessness and duplicities; and with all the exaggerations of melodramatic romance, which has used it as an ideal representation of organised hypocrisy and cruelty, it appears more sinister still when its workings are described by the sober pen of an historian. That truth is manifest in Mr. Thomas Hope's biography of 'Torquemada' (Allen and Unwin), wherein, with certain qualities shown, as in his kindness to subordinates, the man of blood is revealed, especially in his bitter persecution of the Jews, whose 'scourge' he was. It was the Hebrew strain in his blood through his grandmother, working on his pride and sense of inferiority, which led him to be their supreme misdoer, and after harrowing and torturing them, using against them a most infamous system of spying and treachery, led to their being banished from the Spain of Ferdinand and Isabella. Fanatical assuredly he was; yet he brought to the ordering of his merciless crusade the calm and calculating mind of a finished statesman, able to avoid the cautious interventions of the Popes, who in their weakness and the wanton luxury of their courts were more concerned to make money out of the threatened Jews turned Christian than to protect a harassed people. Torquemada did not invent the great instrument of his cruelties, for that already had existed for two hundred and fifty years, but he made it finally efficient, and here is the story written vividly, and showing incidentally how like in many ways were the methods of that 'Scourge of the Jews' and those of Nazi Germany.

Dr James Mackinnon, the Regius Professor Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History at Edinburgh University, amongst his published works on religious and constitutional progress, has written comprehensive studies of Calvin and Luther. He has followed up those volumes with an account of 'The Origins of the Reformation' (Longmans), written in the same lucid and tolerant spirit as they were, and in his search for the causes which brought that great upheaval has gone back to the days when Pope and Emperor were struggling for ascendancy in the government of the world and showing already how worldly-

unwise were the chief powers in Christendom. The Church was decaying through corruption and in its chase of temporal majesty growing materialistic; with the clergy generally forgetting the simplicities and ideals of its Founder, while the hungry poor were restless in revolt. Working on a broad canvas Dr Mackinnon paints in detail the tendencies towards reform that came soon and continuously and in time urgently from representatives of all classes of the community; especially after the division of Papal authority through the rival pope at Avignon and the Great Schism had accentuated the bitterness prevailing and made of holy religion an evil aspect of European politics. The story unfolded often is terrible; vileness and saintliness being brought into strong contrast, with blood and cruelty staining what should have been the fairest of escutcheons. It is also a tangled story of oppressions and desperate risings with such efforts to mend the rot as those of Francis, whose reforming zeal was soon lost in the corruption of his followers, and of our own Wyclif and the Bohemian John Huss, whose heroic story is of a peculiar interest to these days, with the efforts of Jerome of Prague and Savonarola, a genius for religious and social reform, led through the defects of his marvellous qualities to fiery martyrdom. In the end came the inevitable; but at what a cost and in what incompleteness!

Amid the doubts and pessimisms of a world that seems to have gone wrong, and badly wrong for the time being, it is refreshing to come to Professor Emil Brunner's Christian anthropology '*Man in Revolt*' (R.T.S., Lutterworth Press), for with reasonable concessions to modern thought it puts a case for the realities and necessity of religion. Having asked the question 'What is Man?' the author proceeds to answer it by going back to the scriptural teachings of Luther and Augustine, and by interpreting the Bible in that conservative spirit which 'lops the withered branch away.' The story of Adam is not taken literally, and therefore the doctrine of Original Sin is not regarded as revealing the historical *origin* of sin, but as 'the universal and irresistible *power* of sin as affecting man's being.' Similarly the truth of Evolution is accepted, Professor Brunner asserting that no Christian ought to deny to-day, on account of his Christian faith, the extreme probability of the Doctrine of Descent,

and no theologian ought to deny it on account of his theology. The controversy, he adds, which on the side of theology has been carried on against the theory of evolution, is certainly 'nothing to be proud of.' Through this attempt, brilliant in appeal as in its powers of statement (for which Miss Olive Wyon, the translator, also deserves credit) and purpose, to realise more truly the spiritual likeness of man to the image of God, the structure of religious faith has been strengthened, and although there are aspects of its theme from which many theologians will differ, it yet serves the end of strengthening the spiritual foundations of the better order of human life.

Of the sincerity of the Rev. Cyril C. Dobson's little book on 'The Mystery of the Fate of the Ark of the Covenant' (Williams and Norgate) there can be no question; but as to the theories it urges, they do not convince. Briefly, they are that when at the time of Zedekiah Jerusalem including the Temple was destroyed by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah saved the Ark of the Covenant and concealed it in Mount Nebo. Afterwards with a companion, who it is suggested was Baruch the scribe, and with one of the daughters of Zedekiah, the prophet travelled to Ireland, bearing a box which possibly contained particulars as to where the Ark was hidden, so that at the coming of the Messiah it may be recovered. That box, it is claimed, was buried in the hill of Tara. As an offshoot to that remarkable adventure comes the theory that Zedekiah's daughter married the Ardath or High King of Ireland, with British-Jewish consequences that now are familiar through the propaganda of Buckingham Gate. Mr Dobson's argument rests on a vast deal of conjecture, and its weakest part, which he appears to think is strong, has to do with a cryptogram in the writings of Jeremiah. The extravagances of the Baconians have taught us to be suspicious of such cryptograms, and on this occasion we are told nothing of how it is found. Does it appear in the original Aramaic, or in the Septuagint, or in the Authorised Version? Anyhow the assumptions made by this book would need, beyond scholarship, miracles to justify them.

The 'International Library of Psychology and Sexology,' edited by Mr Norman Haire, has just issued a second volume, by M. René Guyon, to the series. It

is 'Sexual Freedom' (Lane). Although its sale is restricted to members of medical, legal, and educational professions and students of social science, it is nothing worse or better than a psychological thesis on the necessity of getting rid of sexual taboos. Less than a generation ago, even so mild and reasonable a study as this would have been contemptuously relegated by Mrs Grundy to her top shelf; but that also was a time when the dirty joke which brought a snigger was a favourite form of humour in smoking-rooms, and many music halls and theatres. Whether that old fondness for talking bawdy, to use the phrase of Sir Robert Walpole, still holds or not, there is no question that less prudery and Chadband starchness and uncharity in thought and action against those who have 'gone too far' sexually prevails, with the result that the world in consequence is franker and must be healthier in its acceptance of sex-truths. Whether mankind is as lustily prone to sexual indulgence, as M. Guyon suggests, is doubtful; while to be disciplined in chastity is not as discreditable as he appears to think. To some extent this book seems to exaggerate; but it is sensible and it is clean.

There are—how many ways?—of describing tribal lays; but we need not use Kipling's tag further except by saying that however many of *those* there may be, they are not nearly so many as the definitions abounding of comedy, humour, and laughter: and still philosophers and other potentates of a like kind are not satisfied! With a courage heroic Mr. James Feibleman has ventured on that voyage of verbal and other discovery in a volume 'In Praise of Comedy' (Allen and Unwin), that is in patches light-hearted and in effect profound. If he has not come to any plain conclusion, he has interpreted his theme in a hundred ways and in his pursuit of comedy evidently enjoyed himself, though at times a little darkly. He points out the seriousness of the very ancients. There could not be any comedy, humour, or laughter among the Egyptians through their continual harpings on the mysterious realities of the tomb; and he reminds us of the saying of the Writer of Ecclesiastes—'I said of laughter, It is mad: and of mirth, what doeth it?' In his effort he has gathered wisdom from philosophers as diverse as Freud and Charlie Chaplin; and out of the

multitude of his witnesses gets merely a confusing commixture of light. When he wishes to illustrate his argument with a joke, he has, he confesses, not chosen it from the best examples, lest the reader should appreciate that without so much noticing his argument. To show how difficult the philosophical examination of comedy is, he quotes Freud as declaring that Don Quixote 'is purely a comic figure' but 'a figure who possesses no humour.' The second part of that judgment in some particular respect may be true; but to call that brave, simple knight purely comic shows that, however helpful a philosopher may be in some ways, he is not a sure judge of human character or of the comic element. The best remark in the book comes appropriately from Mark Twain: 'Wagner's music is not as bad as it sounds.'

Happy is the governor of a province, especially of one in Asia, whom the gods have blessed with humour. Most happy, therefore, should Major C. S. Jarvis be and as his pen proves him. Already, in the company of the comic artist 'Roly,' he has poked kindly fun at the stock Egyptian, but in '**The Back Garden of Allah**' (Murray), it is the turn of the Arab, though 'Gippy' and his idiosyncracies are not quite forgotten. The inconsequence and sublime illogicalities, the imperturbable self-satisfaction over their inefficiencies of those gentleman must be tiring for the impatient, but they make for amusing reading. Major Jarvis finds humour everywhere: of the motor-car which when set going would have gone perfectly if the wheels had not been removed, and the pigeons that when made government messengers forgot their missions and wandered after casual loves; of the well of sweet water dirtied by Arabs and their animals which must be kept clean, as it was kept by a martinet in his own absurdly insufficient way; with other aspects of the Oriental mind in its peculiar workings, Major Jarvis tells in so pleasant a manner that his book is refreshing; and should prove especially so in these harassed and harassing times.

# INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD VOLUME OF THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of  
articles are printed in italics.]

## A.

- Adler, Dr Alfred, 'Understanding Human Nature,' 47, 52-54.  
de Alaminos, Antonio, and the Gulf Stream, 146.  
**Alba, Spain, England, and the Duke of**, 35-46.  
Albania, and Italy, 100-105.  
Alexander, Dr Franz, joint author of 'The Criminal, the Judge, and the Public,' 47, 55, 59.  
Alexander, King of Yugoslavia, 104-106.  
Alfonso XII, restoration of, 232, 235, 237.  
Alfonso, XIII, 35, 42-43, 237, 240-241.  
**America and Isolation**, 246-261.  
Anderson, Sir John, on bomb-proof shelters, 82.  
**Anglo-Turkish Agreement**, The, 112.  
**Arms and the Empire Overseas**, 306-320.  
Arnold, Matthew, 277-278, 280, 322.  
Aspinall, A., editor of 'The Letters of George IV,' 116.  
Asquith, Lord, 347-348, 351.  
Ataturk, Kemal, 112.  
Australia, rearmament programme of, 310-313, 316, 318.

## B.

- Bache, Alexander Dallas, 147.  
Baker, Howard, 'Introduction to Tragedy,' 184.

Vol. 273.—No. 542.

- Baker, Joseph, 23.  
Baldwin, Lord, 162.  
Balfour, A. J., on the importance of the Crown, 354.  
Balkan Entente Pact, 99-100, 106, 109.  
**Balkans, A Bird's-Eye View of the**, 98-115.  
*Barrington, Michael*, 'Spain, England, and the Duke of Alba,' 35.  
*Baskett, Dr B. G. M.*, 'The Value of State Social Services,' 262.  
*Belgion, Montgomery*, 'The Vogue of Rumour,' 1.  
Bell, Reginald W., joint author of 'The History of the London County Council, 1889-1939'..174.  
Bennett, Arnold, on the Germans, 197.  
Berdyaev, Nicolas, 'Spirit and Reality,' 181.  
Beveridge, Sir William, 'Prices and Wages in England,'..177-178.  
Binyon, Laurence, translator of Dante's 'Purgatorio,' 275, 281-282.  
**Bird's-Eye View of the Balkans**, A, 98-115.  
Bland, John, joint author of 'England's Water Problem,' 365.  
Bledisloe, Lord, and museums improvements, 321.  
Bloomfield, Sir Benjamin, 122.  
*Blyton, W. J.*, 'Old Germanies for New,' 189.  
Bolingbroke, Viscount, 'Dissertation on Parties,' 337, 340-345.  
Books, Some Recent, 170-188, 362-374.



- Boris, King of Bulgaria, 107-108, 110.
- British Council in Europe, The, 133-145.
- British Fisheries, The Gulf Stream and, 146-155.
- Brougham, Henry, and Caroline of Brunswick, 125-126.
- Brougham, James, 125-126.
- Brüning, Dr. and a Hohenzollern restoration, 242-243.
- Brunner, Emil, 'Man in Revolt,' 371-372.
- Bryant, Arthur, and the restoration of Charles II, 231—'Samuel Pepys, III,' 368.
- Bulgaria, German penetration in, 109—ambitions of rulers of, 110-111.
- Burke, Edmund, 'Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontents (1770): Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs (1791)'..337-338, 343-344.
- Burr, Malcolm, 'The Insect Legion,' 366.
- C.
- Cade, Jack, 70.
- Call, The, 355-361.
- Callan, Father Charles J., joint author of 'Moral Theology, Based on St. Thomas Aquinas and the Best Modern Authorities,' 52.
- 'Cambridge Ancient History, The,' 170-171.
- Canada, rearmament programme of, 308-310, 317-318.
- Canning, George, 119-120, 130-132.
- Carlos, Don, 235-236.
- Carol, King of Rumania, 111-112.
- Caroline of Brunswick, 124-126, 130.
- Carlyle, Thomas, 203, 213.
- 'Carnegie United Kingdom Trust, The. Twenty-fifth Annual Report,' 321-322, 333.
- Castlereagh, Lord, 116-117, 120, 122, 129-130.
- Century of Postal Service, A, 19-34.
- Chamberlain, Neville, 80, 83, 157, 165, 168-169, 202, 213, 338.
- Chambord, Comte de, 234-235, 238.
- Chaos in Proprietary Medicine Law, The, 219-230.
- Charles II, restoration of, 231-235.
- Charlotte, Princess, 117, 119, 124.
- Chaucer, 211-212.
- Churchill, Winston, 352.
- Ciano, Count, 103.
- Clements, Frank, 'The British Council in Europe,' 133.
- Clifton, Violet, 'Charister,' 275, 282-283.
- Collins, Churton, on 'The Patriot King,' 342.
- Colonial Empire, defence of, 314-318.
- Condylis, General, 237-238.
- Conrad, Joseph, 194, 197.
- Cosgrave, William, 292-293, 304.
- Coudenhove-Kalergi, Count R. N., 'The Totalitarian State against Man,' 86-87, 91, 93 and note, 95-97.
- Coulton, G. G., *Litt. D.*, 'A Plea for Social History,' 203.
- Cowie, Donald, 'Arms and the Empire Overseas,' 306.
- Cromwell, Oliver, 232-233, 341.
- Crown. The, importance in the British type of Democracy of, 353-354.
- Cumberland, Ernest, Duke of, 129.
- Cunard, Samuel, 27.
- Czernin, Count Ferdinand, 'Europe, Going, Going, Gone,' 192.
- D.
- Daudet, Léon, on General Franco, 35.
- Dawson, Christopher, on the prestige of kingship, 239—'Beyond Politics,' 337, 349.
- Delinquency and Psychology, 47-60.
- De Quincey, and Germany, 195-196.
- de Valera, Eamon, 291-299, 303-304.
- Disraeli, 162—'The Vindication of the English Constitution,' 342, 345—'Sybil,' 343, 345-346—'Coningsby,' 345-346—political principles of, 344-346.
- Dobson Cyril C., 'The Mystery of the Fate of the Ark of the Covenant,' 372.
- Dodd, Whitwell M., 'Museums,' 321.

Dolfuss, Dr, 359.  
Duarte, Don, 242.  
Dunsany, Lord, 'Mirage Water,'  
275, 286.

E.

East, Dr W. Norwood, joint author  
of 'The Psychological Treatment  
of Crime,' 47, 53-59.  
Eden, Anthony, 251.  
Eire, defence of, 313-314.  
Eldon, Lord, 124.  
Ellison, Lieut-General Sir Gerald,  
82.  
**Empire Overseas, Arms and the,**  
306-320.  
Empire Overseas, part played in the  
Great War by, 306-307—unity of,  
319-320.  
**English Way of Life, The,** 156-  
169.  
Ervine, St John, 'The State and  
the Soul,' 181-182.  
Esher, late Lord, 117.  
Eugénie, Empress, Duke of Alba on,  
38.  
Evelyn, John, 231.

F.

Fabian, Robert, 62, 69.  
Faulhaber, Cardinal, 191.  
Feibleman, James, 'In Praise of  
Comedy,' 373-374.  
Ferdinand, ex-King of Bulgaria,  
107-108, 110-111.  
Ferdinand VII, of Spain, 235-236.  
Ferguson, Rachel, 'Passionate Ken-  
sington,' 186-187.  
Fianna Fail, aims of, 291-292, 295-  
296, 298.  
FitzAlwyn, Henry and John, 62-  
63.  
'Floersheim, Cecil, The Collected  
Poems of,' 275, 285.  
Fortescue, Sir John, 'De Laudibus  
Legum Angliæ,' 156.  
Foss, W., joint author of 'The  
Spanish Arena,' 35, 43.  
Foster, Michael, 'American Dream,'  
252-253.  
Foxe, John, 61.

Franco, General, 2, 35, 44-45, 75,  
78-79, 98, 167, 240-242.  
Franklin, Benjamin, and the Gulf  
Stream, 146-147.  
**Frightfulness in the Air,** 74-85.

G.

Gambetta, 34.  
*Geddes, A. St Clair*, 'The Chaos in  
Proprietary Medicine Law,' 219.  
George II, King of Greece, 114, 232,  
237-238, 241.  
George III, 342-343.  
George VI, message to his people of,  
338.  
**George IV, The Letters of,** 116-  
132.  
Gerahty, C., joint author of 'The  
Spanish Arena,' 35, 43.  
Gibbon, Sir Gwilym, joint author  
of 'The History of the London  
County Council, 1889-1939,' 174.  
Gladstone, W. E., 350-351.  
Glyn-Jones, Sir William, 220-221.  
Goebbels, Dr, 192, 194, 198, 201, 358,  
360.  
Goering, Field Marshal, 74-75, 108-  
109, 358.  
Goethe, 189, 195-196.  
Goldsmith, Oliver, 340.  
Gooch, Bernard, 'The Quiet World  
of Nature,' 365-366.  
*Gould-Adams, R. J. N.*, 'America  
and Isolation,' 246.  
Gorell, Lord, 'Last of the English  
and other New Poems,' 275, 283-  
285.  
**Great Chronicle of London, The,**  
61-73.  
Greenwood, Arthur, on social ser-  
vices, 262—on the necessity for a  
Parliamentary Opposition, 338.  
Greenville, Lord, 118-120.  
Grey, Charles Earl, 117-120, 128.  
Grey, Sir Edward, 251.  
**Gulf Stream and British  
Fisheries, The,** 146-155.  
Guyon, René, 'Sexual Freedom,' 372-  
373.

H.

Halifax, Lord, 300-301, 320.  
Hall, Philip, 229.

- 'Handbook of British Birds, III,' 188.  
 Harewood, Lord, and museums improvements, 321-322.  
 Harrop, A. J., 'My New Zealand,' 307.  
 Hawgood, John A., 'Modern Constitutions since 1787' . . 364-365.  
 Heaton, Henniker, 32.  
 Heine, H., 189, 199, 281.  
 Helsby, Cyril, 78.  
 Henriques, Basil, 'Indiscretions of a Warden,' 266.  
 Henry IV, 65.  
 Henry V, 65-66.  
 Henry VI, 66, 70.  
 Henry VII, 66-68.  
 Herron, Ima Honaker, 'The Small Town in American Literature,' 184-185.  
 Hertzog, General, and friendship with Britain, 320.  
 Hill, Sir Rowland, 19, 21-24, 33.  
 Hindenburg, and a Hohenzollern restoration, 243.  
 Hitler, 13, 15, 17, 35, 85, 166, 193-195, 201, 239, 242-244, 249, 313, 337, 355-356, 358-360.  
 Hoare, Sir Samuel, and the I.R.A., 290, 302.  
 Hobbs, Thomas, 89.  
 Honey, William Bowyer, compiler of 'The Sacred Fire. An Anthology of English Poems from the Fourteenth Century to the Present Day,' 275, 277-279, 280, 285, 288.  
 Hoover, ex-President, 74, 80, 84.  
 Hope, Thomas, 'Torquemada,' 370.  
 Hore-Belisha, L., 318.  
 Howe, Dr E. Graham, 'Motives and Mechanisms of the Mind,' 47, 52, 57.  
 Hubert, W. H. de B., joint author of 'The Psychological Treatment of Crime,' 47, 53-59.  
 Hudson, Derek, 'A Poet in Parliament,' 367.  
 Hutchinson, Lord, and Caroline of Brunswick, 126.

## I.

- Illner, Dr Olga*, 'A Century of Postal Service,' 19.  
 India, defence of, 313.

- Inge, Dr, 60.  
 Inonu, General Ismet, 113.  
 Irish Republican Army, The, 289-305.  
 I.R.A., composition and strength of, 289-291—activities of, 291-292, 294-302—aims of, 292-295.  
 Irish Republican Brotherhood, 289, 292, 301.  
 Irvine, William, 'Walter Bagehot,' 368-369.

## J.

- Jarvis, C. S., 'The Back Garden of Allah,' 374.  
 Johnson, Geoffrey, 'The New Road and Other Poems,' 275, 287.  
 Jones, Sir Roderick, 5, 10.

## K.

- Kant, E., 189, 195.  
 Katharine of Aragon, 63, 68, 71.  
 Keats, John, 282, 288, 325-326.  
 Keith, Arthur Berriedale, 'The British Cabinet System, 1830-1938,' . . 176-177.  
 Kent, William, 'London Worthies,' 175.  
 Kenyon, Sir Frederick, 44.  
 King, Mackenzie, 309, 319-320.  
 Kingsford, C. L., 61.  
 Kipling, 25, 82, 199.  
 Knighton, Sir William, and George IV, 122-123, 127, 130.  
 Koch, R., 270.  
 Kornis, Jules, 'L'Homme d'Etat. Analyse de l'Esprit Politique,' 337, 350.

## L.

- Lafourcade, Georges, 'Arnold Bennett,' 182-183.  
 Landsdowne, Lord, 128.  
 Langdon-Davies, John, 'Air Raid,' 76.  
 Langley, Hubert, 'Dr Arne,' 187.  
 Lawrence, C. E., 'The Sacred Fire,' 275.  
 Lawrence, T. E., 'Oriental Assembly,' 180-181.  
 Leach, John, 124.

Leche, J. H., 77-78.  
*Legh, Peter*, 'Philosophic Foundations of Politics,' 86.  
 Lejeune, Lieut-Colonel F. B., 76-77.  
 de Leon, Ponce, and the Gulf Stream, 146.  
 Lessing, G. E., 192, 196.  
 Letters of George IV, The, 116-132.  
 Lichfield, Lord, and Postal Reform, 22.  
 Liddell Hart, B. H., 'The Defence of Britain,' 363-364.  
 Life, The English Way of, 156-169.  
 Liverpool, Lord, 120, 123-124, 126-127, 129-131.  
 Lloyd, Roger, 'The Golden Middle Age,' 173.  
 Locke, John, 89.  
 Lombroso, C., 'Crime, its Causes and Remedies,' 52.  
 London, The Great Chronicle of, 61-73.  
 Louis XIV, and cheap postage, 23.  
 Louis XVIII, restoration of, 232, 234, 242-243.  
 Luce, Siméon, 213-214.

## M.

Macdonald, Ramsay, 347-348, 350.  
 Mackinnon, James, 'The Origins of the Reformation,' 370-371.  
 Macmahon, Colonel, and correspondence of George IV, 122.  
 Magnus, Sir Philip, 'Edmund Burke,' 337, 343.  
 Maguire, Rev. T., and sentences on I.R.A. members, 298-299.  
 Maitland, F. W., 205.  
 Mann, Thomas, 194.  
 Manuel II of Portugal, 242.  
 Marconi, Senator, 31.  
 Markham, S. F., M.P., 'A Report on the Museums and Art Galleries of the British Isles (other than the National Museums),' 321-329, 331, 333-335.  
 Marriott, Sir John A. R., 'The Evolution of the British Empire,' 172.  
*Marriott, Sir John A. R.*, 'National Unity and Party Government,' 337.

Martineau, Harriett, and Postal Reform, 22.  
 Marx, Karl, 199.  
 Maugham, Lord, 81-82.  
 Maury, Lieut. M. F., U.S.N., 'The Physical Geography of the Sea,' 146, 148.  
 McHugh, Father John A., joint author of 'Moral Theology, Based on St Thomas Aquinas and the Best Modern Authorities,' 52.  
 Mégroz, R. L., 'The Dream World,' 187.  
 'Mein Kampf,' 189, 201.  
 Melbourne, Lord, 21-22.  
 Menzies, R. G., on Australian support for Britain, 320.  
 Metaxas, General, 114.  
 von Metzsch, General, 85.  
 Miers, Sir Henry, 332.  
 Mill, John Stuart, 89.  
 Milton, John, 218, 276, 278.  
 Mitford, Hon. Evelyn, 'Lord Redesdale,' 180.  
 Moira, Lord, 119-121, 124.  
 Molson, Hugh, 'The English Way of Life,' 156.  
 Morris, Albert, 'Criminology,' 53.  
 Morris, J., M.P., 4.  
 Mullins, Claud, 'Delinquency and Psychology,' 47.  
 Mulloch, Hon. William, 32.  
 Murray, Dr Gilbert, translator of 'Æschylus: The Persians (Persæ),' 275, 281.

## Museums, 321-336.

Mussolini, 13, 15, 35-36, 103, 162, 165-166.

## N.

Napoleon I, 116-117, 120-121, 127-128, 243-244, 356-357.  
 National Unity and Party Government, 337-354.  
 Newman, Sir George, 265-266, 268.  
 New Zealand, rearmament programme of, 312, 316, 318.  
 Niemöller, Pastor, 358.  
 Nietzsche, 199-200.

## O.

O'Ferrall, Richard More, 297, 299.  
 O'Higgins, Brian, 296, 303.

O'Higgins, Kevin, 294.

Old Germanies for New, 182-202.

Ostrogorski, M., 'Democracy and the Organisation of Political Parties,' 337.

Otto, Archduke, and possible Hapsburg restoration, 244.

## P.

Pailthorpe, Dr Grace, 'What we Put in Prison,' 47.

Pariani, General Alberto, 102, 104.

Paris, Comte de, 244-245.

Party Government, National Unity and, 337-354.

Party System, origin and development of, 341-344, 346-348—indispensability to efficient working of Parliamentary Democracy of, 350-354.

Paul, Prince Regent of Yugoslavia, 99, 106.

Peel, Sir Robert, 22, 131-132.

Penaranda, Duke of, 36, 44.

Perceval, Spencer, 118-119.

Petrie, Sir Charles, Bart, 'Restorations,' 231.

Petter, Guy B., 'George Meredith and His German Critics,' 183.

Philosophic Foundations of Politics, 86-97.

Pirenne, Henri, 'A History of Europe,' 171-172.

Pirow, O., on South African defence, 311.

Pius XII, 241.

Plea for Social History, A, 203-218.

Plumbe, Wilfred J., 'Kingdom of Earth. Poems,' 275, 286-287.

Politics, Philosophic Foundations of, 86-97.

Postal Service, A Century of, 19-34.

Preece, Sir William, 29, 31.

Proprietary Medicine Law, The Chaos in, 219-230.

Psychology, Delinquency and, 47-60.

## R.

Radcliffe, C. W., 'Middlesex—The Jubilee of the County Council,' 174-175.

Reade, Aleya Lyell, 'Johnsonian Gleanings,' 186.

Redmond, John, 289, 292.

Rees, Dr J. R., 'The Health of the Mind,' 54.

'Report on the Progress and Condition of the United States National Museum for the Year ended June 30, 1938'... 321-322.

Restorations, 231-245.

Richard II, deposition of, 65.

Richard III, 67.

de Rivera, General Primo, 240-241.

Roberts, R. Ellis, 'Portrait of Stella Benson,' 185-186.

Romanones, Count of, 41-42.

Roosevelt, President Franklin, 83-84, 361.

Roosevelt, Theodore, 7.

Rousseau, J. J., 89.

Rumour, The Vogue of, 1-18.

Russell, Bertrand, 'Our Knowledge of the External World,' 95.

Russell, Sean, 298.

Rutter, Owen, 'Regent of Hungary,' 179.

Ryan, Desmond, 'The Sword of Light,' 172-173.

Ryan, Frank, 292, 297.

## S.

Sacred Fire, The, 275-288.

Salazar, Dr, and restoration of the Monarchy in Portugal, 242.

Salisbury, late Lord, 3.

Salter, Sir Arthur, 'Security: Can We Retrieve It?' 175-176.

Sanderson of Oundle, 327, 336.

Savage, M. J., and New Zealand's support of Britain, 320.

Schmidt, Professor Johannes, 154.

Schooneberg, V. A., 32.

Schuschnigg, Dr, 244, 359.

Scott, Sir Walter, 116-117.

Shakespeare, 329.

Shaw, Sir John, 64, 67.

Sidmouth, Lord, 129.

Simon, Sir John, and the General Strike of 1926, 164—and proposal to abolish taxation of proprietary medicines, 219, 228.

Sinclair, Sir Archibald, 1-2.

Smuts, General, 320, 354.

Smyth-Pigott, Group-Captain R., 76-77.

Snape, R. H., 207-211.

**Social History, A Plea for**, 203-218.

**Some Recent Books**, 170-188, 362-374.

Somerville, Vice-Admiral, murder of, 292, 297.

South Africa, rearmament programme of, 311-313, 317.

Sotelo, Calve, 44.

*Spaight, J. M., C.B., C.B.E.*, 'Frightfulness in the Air,' 74.

**Spain, England, and the Duke of Alba**, 35-46.

Spaulding, Miss E. H., editor of 'Piers Plowman Histories,' 203, 207.

Spence-Sales, H., joint author of 'England's Water Problem,' 365.

Stanley, Carleton, 'Matthew Arnold,' 275, 277-278, 280.

**State Social Services, The Value of**, 262-274.

Staub, Hugo, joint author of 'The Criminal, the Judge and the Public,' 47, 55, 59.

Stephen, Fitzjames, 'History of the Criminal Law,' 50.

Stephen, Leslie, 50.

Stevens, George, joint author of 'Best Sellers: Are They Born or Made?' 366-367.

Stimson, Henry L., 74, 84.

Stow, John, 61-62.

Stoyadinovitch, Dr. 107.

*Swire, J.*, 'A Bird's-Eye View of the Balkans,' 98.

T.

**The Call**, 355-361.

Thomas, A. A., LL.D., joint editor of 'The Great Chronicle of London,' 61.

Thompson, James Westfall, 'The Medieval Library,' 362-363.

Thompson, John A., Alexandre Dumas Père and Spanish Romantic Drama,' 363.

Thornley, I. D., joint editor of 'The Great Chronicle of London,' 61.

'Thornley Thomas, The Collected Verse of,' 275-276, 285-286.

Thornton, R. H., 'British Shipping,' 178-179.

Trenchard, Lord, 75-76.

Tucker, Eisdell, 'Stony Ground. New Verse on an Old Theme,' 275, 287-288.

Tudor, Owen, 66.

U.

Unwin, Professor, 'Gilds of London,' 216.

Unwin, Stanley, joint author of 'Best Sellers: Are they born or Made?' 366-367.

V.

**Value of State Social Services, The**, 262-274.

Vaughan, C. J., 210.

Veltchev, Colonel Damian, 108-109.

Veragua, Duke of, 36, 44.

de Villavieja, Marquis, 'Life has been Good,' 37, 39-40.

**Vogue of Rumour, The**, 1-18.

W.

Wakefield, Lord, 61, 73.

Webster, C. K., 116, 124.

Wellington, Duke of, 116, 123, 129, 131-132.

Wexberg, Dr Erwin, Individual Psychology,' 47, 53-54, 58.

Wilhelm II, Kaiser, 193-194, 201.

Willesley, Marquis, 118-120.

Williams, Bristol, transcriber of 'Orion and Other Anonymous and Hitherto Unpublished Poems attributed to John Keats,' 275, 282.

Wilson, Sir Henry, 301.

Wilson, Mrs Woodrow, 'Memoirs,' 369.



Wilson, President Woodrow, 250.  
Wood, Sir Kingsley, on social services, 262.  
Wordsworth, W., 278, 280.

## Y.

*Yonge, Professor C. M.*, 'The Gulf Stream and British Fisheries,' 146.

*Young, G. M.*, 'The Letters of George IV,' 116.  
Yugoslavia, and Italy, 105-107, 113.

## Z.

Zamora, President, 42-43.  
Zinoviev Letter, The, 16.  
Zog, King, 102-104.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-THIRD VOLUME

# World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

**THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY**

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

*Send for Price List*

